arXiv:1402.3906v1 [math.HO] 17 Feb 2014

Introduction to Combinatorial Topology

Kurt Reidemeister
Translated by John Stillwell, with the assistance of Warren Dicks

February 18, 2014

Foreword

The first three chapters of this book deal with infinite groups; the last four with line and surface complexes and especially with 2-dimensional manifolds. This choice of material may be justified from several standpoints.

In the first place I was concerned to work out the profound connections between groups and complexes. The close connection between these two fields has been known since the basic work of HENRI POINCARÉ. If it has not been plainly evident in the further development of combinatorial topology, then this is due to the problems where topology and group theory meet: it seems unfruitful to pursue connections which primarily permit only the translation of unsolved topological questions into unsolved group-theoretic questions. Today such thoughts are no longer justifiable. Since generators and defining relations of subgroups of groups presented by generators and relations may be determined, group theory provides a profitable instrument of computation for topology, with which several previously inaccessible questions become subject to systematic investigation. Conversely, complexes perform a valuable service in making group-theoretic theorems more intuitive and making geometric examination fruitful for groups; e.g., planar complexes give information about the structure of planar discontinuous groups.

Accordingly, I have developed the theory of groups presented by generators and relations as fully as possible, and have favored those fields of topology that best demonstrate the connection between groups and complexes, and which permit new group-theoretic results to be obtained. If, as a result, the topology of 3-dimensional manifolds is not explicitly mentioned, nevertheless all methods necessary to attack problems in this area are presented.

I hope that the reader who wants to acquire a few tools for further work and to learn positive geometric results in a polished logical structure will also be content with the choice of material. In the last four chapters there are numerous results immediately accessible to the intuition and which are derived in a logically transparent way from a few simple axioms about points, line segments, and surface simplexes. I believe that Chapters 4 to 6 in particular will present no difficulties in comprehension. Perhaps it is advisable for the reader to begin with these chapters and, where necessary, to refer back to the prerequisites on groups. But Chapters 1 and 2 will also present little difficulty for most readers. The sections on groups with operators, as well as Chapters 3 and 7 (Chapter 7 is written somewhat tersely), may be omitted the first time.

Apart from a small sketch in F. LEVI'S "Geometrische Konfigurationen" (Hirzel

1929), combinatorial topology has not previously been given a comprehensive presentation from the viewpoint adopted here. So this book relies on the original literature, the results of which must often be newly derived in the interests of a uniform structure, and a few lectures of the author. I have received the most fruitful encouragement from the conversations and work of my late friend OTTO SCHREIER. Chapters 4 and 6 represent the execution of a program drawn up by M. DEHN in an address to the Naturforscherversammlung in Leipzig, 1922. Unfortunately, this address has not appeared in print. I am pleased to be able to present the Freiheitssatz formulated by DEHN and recently proved by MAGNUS. Chapter 7 contains various previously unpublished theorems on branched coverings.

In completing the manuscript and overseeing corrections, L. GOERITZ, W. MAGNUS, E. PODEHL and G. SZEGÖ have rendered me valuable assistance.

Königsberg, May 1932

Kurt Reidemeister

Contents

Foreword **i**

Introduction **1**

1 Groups **3**
1.1 Definition of the Group Concept . . . 3
1.2 Cyclic Groups . . . 5
1.3 Multiplication of Residue Classes . . . 6
1.4 Groups of Transformations . . . 8
1.5 Subgroups . . . 10
1.6 Conjugate Subgroups . . . 11
1.7 Congruence Subgroups of the Modular Group . . . 13
1.8 Residue Classes modulo Subgroups . . . 14
1.9 Residue Classes modulo Congruence Subgroups of the Modular Group 16
1.10 Factor Groups . . . 16
1.11 Isomorphisms . . . 17
1.12 Automorphisms . . . 18
1.13 Groups with Operators . . . 20
1.14 Groups and Transformation Groups . . . 22
1.15 The Groupoid . . . 23

2 Free Groups and their Factor Groups **25**
2.1 Generators and Defining Relations . . . 25
2.2 Free Groups . . . 26
2.3 The Word Problem for Free Groups . . . 28
2.4 The Transformation Problem in Free Groups . . . 29
2.5 Groups with Arbitrary Relations . . . 30
2.6 The general word problem . . . 31
2.7 The free product of groups . . . 33
2.8 A transformation problem . . . 35
2.9 Generators and relations for the modular group . . . 36
2.10 A theorem of TIETZE . . . 38
2.11 Commutative groups . . . 41
2.12 A theorem on matrices . . . 42

2.13 Characterization of commutative groups 44
2.14 Commutative groups with operators 46
2.15 Characterization of groups with operators 48
2.16 Divisibility properties of L-polynomials 50
2.17 Greatest common divisor 52
2.18 An example 53
2.19 Factor groups with respect to commutator groups 54

3 Determination of Subgroups **57**
3.1 Generators of Subgroups 57
3.2 Generators of the subgroup as special generators of the group 58
3.3 Properties of the replacement process 60
3.4 Defining relations 61
3.5 SCHREIER'S normalized replacement process 62
3.6 SCHREIER'S choice of representatives G 63
3.7 The relations of the second kind 64
3.8 Invariant subgroups 67
3.9 Subgroups of special groups 68
3.10 Generators and defining relations of the congruence subgroup $\mathfrak{U}_p$ . . . 70
3.11 The relations $U_{G,S}^{u_{G,S}}$ of the group $\mathfrak{U}_p$ 72
3.12 Commutator groups 74
3.13 The Freiheitssatz (the freeness theorem) 76
3.14 Determination of automorphisms 79

4 Line Segment Complexes **83**
4.1 The concept of a line segment complex 83
4.2 Orders of points. Regular complexes 84
4.3 The Königsberg bridge problem 85
4.4 Trees 86
4.5 The connectivity number 87
4.6 The fundamental group of a line segment complex 89
4.7 Coverings of complexes 91
4.8 Paths and coverings 93
4.9 Simplicity of a covering 94
4.10 Coverings and permutations 95
4.11 Fundamental domains 96
4.12 Regular complexes of even order 96
4.13 Modifications of regular complexes 97
4.14 Invariance of the decomposition 98
4.15 Regular complexes of degree three 99
4.16 Coverings and permutation groups 100
4.17 Residue class group diagrams 101
4.18 Regular Coverings 102
4.19 Iterated Coverings and Groups 103
4.20 Transformations into Itself 104

5 Surface Complexes **107**
5.1 The Concept of a Surface Complex 107
5.2 Stars 108
5.3 Manifolds 109
5.4 An Auxiliary Manifold 110
5.5 Dual Manifolds 111
5.6 Dual Line Segment Complexes 112
5.7 Elementary Transformations 113
5.8 Elementary Relatedness of Manifolds 115
5.9 Reduction to Normal Form 116
5.10 Neighboring Normal Forms 117
5.11 Canonical Normal Forms 118
5.12 Normal Forms with Retention of a Segment 121
5.13 Orientability. Characteristic 123

6 Groups and Surface Complexes **127**
6.1 The Fundamental Group of a Surface Complex 127
6.2 Invariance of the Fundamental Group under Elementary Transformations 128
6.3 Homotopy and Homology 129
6.4 Simple Paths on Manifolds 130
6.5 Intersection Numbers 131
6.6 One-sided and Two-sided Paths 134
6.7 Simple Strips 135
6.8 Normal Forms and Fundamental Groups 136
6.9 Manifolds with Two Surface Pieces and Two Points 136
6.10 Elementary Relatedness and Isomorphism 137
6.11 Some Problems 139
6.12 Coverings of Surface Complexes 141
6.13 Coverings of Line Segment and Surface Complexes 141
6.14 The Fundamental Group of the Covering Complex 142
6.15 Regular Coverings 143
6.16 Coverings of Manifolds 144

7 Branched Coverings **147**
7.1 The Concept of a Branched Covering 147
7.2 Self-transformations and Automorphisms 148
7.3 Principal Group of a Regular Covering 149
7.4 Structure of the Principal Group 150
7.5 Group Diagrams and Manifolds 151
7.6 Point-type Branching 153
7.7 Elementarily Related Coverings 154
7.8 Normal Forms of Coverings 154
7.9 Principal Groups in Normal Form 155
7.10 Properties of Elementarily Related Coverings 156
7.11 Subgroups of Planar Groups 157

7.12 Branching Numbers of Subgroups 158
7.13 Automorphisms of Groups of Manifolds 159
7.14 The Word Problem for Planar Groups 161
7.15 Word Problems in Planar Group Diagrams 162
7.16 Re-entrant Vertices and Critical Subpaths 163
7.17 Simple Paths in Planar Complexes 164
7.18 Planar Group Diagrams and Non-Euclidean Geometry 165

Introduction

If one wants to investigate surfaces globally, it is often appropriate to divide them into finitely many surface pieces, bounded by finitely many curve pieces, and identified along these curve pieces in a certain way. This is appropriate for the intuition, which can better control pieces in their totality than the idea of a complicated surface; appropriate from the standpoint of differential geometry, the methods of which initially give access only to elementary pieces of surfaces and curves; and appropriate finally for questions in which the local properties of the surface play no decisive role, e.g., when it is to be decided whether two surfaces may be mapped onto each other one-to-one and continuously. If we call the boundary relations between the surface pieces, curve pieces, and their endpoints the structure of the decomposition then it may be easily shown, e.g., that surfaces possessing decompositions of the same structure may be mapped onto each other one-to-one and continuously, and it is possible to prove the even more plausible converse theorem that surfaces that can be mapped one-to-one can continuously onto each other possess decomositions with the same structure.

However, as soon as the decomposition of a surface is introduced as a tool, it becomes an unavoidable question which properties of the surface are expressed in the structure of a decomposition, or how the structures of different decompositions of the same surface are related. These questions are the starting point of combinatorial topology.

In order to answer them, one first asks about the properties of the elementary surface and curve pieces that bring about the structure. There are a few simple and intuitive facts; say, the fact that a curve piece always has two boundary points, and that a surface piece always has a boundary curve determined by finitely many curve pieces. By formulating these facts in axioms it is then possible to delimit an area of geometry—the combinatorial topology of line segments and surface complexes—the foundation of which is as logically clear as it is intuitively satisfactory. The results of this theory present a noteworthy contrast to the axioms, in that they lead very quickly to questions that are as difficult to answer as they are easy to ask. The classical and popular example of this is the four color problem. No situation can show more clearly that mathematics does not live by logic and intuition alone, and that any theory requires not only unobjectionable axioms but also fruitful ideas.

Here we must mention the group concept, which very soon proves to be an Ariadne thread through the labyrinth of complexes, and which we therefore discuss first, as far as it relevant to combinatorial topology. In this connection, the methods

of determining groups in terms of generators and relations, and deriving properties of the group from these relations, stand in the foreground. This field already has a combinatorial character; the visualization of the group with generators by a line segment complex and the visualization of relations in such a group by elementary surface pieces is just as clear as the attempt to reverse this process by converting arbitrary complexes into "group diagrams." This connection is also important for topology. Topological manifolds, e.g., are in the final analysis none other than representations of groups in which a few order relations compatible with the group structure are established between the generators and relations.

It should be pointed out, however, that the sections on line and surface complexes in Chapters 4 and 5 may be understood without knowledge of the first three chapters on groups.

Chapter 1

Groups

1.1 Definition of the Group Concept

We begin our exposition with an explanation of the group concept and a few simple theorems on groups, subgroups, factor groups, and isomorphisms of groups.

A class $\mathfrak{F}$ of elements is called a group when each ordered pair[1] F_1F_2 is associated with a certain element F_{12} of $\mathfrak{F}$, in symbols

$$F_1F_2 = F_{12} \qquad (F_1 \text{ times } F_2 \text{ equals } F_{12}),$$

and this linking, or multiplication, satisfies the following rules:

A. 1. *If F_1, F_2, F_3 are any three elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ and if*

$$F_1F_2 = F_{12}, \quad F_2F_3 = F_{23}$$

then

$$F_{12}F_3 = F_1F_{23}.$$

We will write this

$$(F_1F_2)F_3 = F_1(F_2F_3) \tag{1}$$

for short.

A. 1. is called the associative law, and a multiplication that satisfies it is called associative.

Because of (1) we can write the product of an ordered triple of factors F_1, F_2, F_3 as

$$F_1F_2F_3 = (F_1F_2)F_3 = F_1(F_2F_3)$$

and, as may be seen by induction, the product of n factors is expressible analogously as

$$F_1F_2\cdots F_n,$$

independent of bracketing.

[1] Notice that Reidemeister denotes an ordered pair simply by juxtaposing its elements. The more usual ordered pair notation (a,b) is used by him as the notation for the *greatest common divisor* of integers a, b in Section 1.3. (Translator's note.)

A. 2. *There is an element E in $\mathfrak{F}$ for which*

$$EF = FE = F$$

for any F in $\mathfrak{F}$. Such an element is known as an identity element.

There can be only one such element; for, if E^* were a second element of this kind, we must have $EE^* = E$ on the one hand, and $EE^* = E^*$ on the other, so that $E = E^*$.

A. 3. *For each element F of $\mathfrak{F}$ there is an element X for which*

$$FX = E. \tag{2}$$

X is called an element inverse to F.

For an element X inverse to F we also have

$$XF = E. \tag{3}$$

This is because there is an element Y for which

$$XY = E. \tag{4}$$

Then multiplication by F gives, on the one hand, that

$$F(XY) = FE = F.$$

While, on the other hand, it follows from (1) and (2) that

$$F(XY) = (FX)Y = EY = Y$$

and hence $Y = F$, so the asserted equation (3) follows from (4). It follows further that there is only one inverse element. On the one hand it follows from $FX_1 = E$ and $FX_2 = E$ that

$$X_2(FX_1) = X_2E = X_2.$$

And since $X_2F = E$ by (3) we have, on the other hand,

$$X_2(FX_1) = (X_2F)X_1 = EX_1 = X_1,$$

and thus $X_1 = X_2$.

If X is the element inverse to F, then F is the element inverse to X. We denote the element inverse to F by F^{-1}, so

$$(F^{-1})^{-1} = F.$$

This symbolism may be extended by the following convention. By F^1 we mean F itself. F^n is defined for positive integers $n > 1$ by induction as

$$F^n = (F^{n-1})F.$$

By F^0 we mean the identity element E, by F^{-n} $(n>0)$ we mean $(F^{-1})^n$; it then follows from the associative law and the properties of the inverse that

$$F^n F^m = F^{m+n}, \quad (F^n)^m = F^{nm}$$

for arbitrary m, n.

F^{-n} is therefore the element inverse to F^n. We call F^n the nth power of the element F. If F_1 and F_2 are two different elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ then we can construct the elements

$$F_1^{n_{11}} F_2^{n_{12}} F_1^{n_{21}} F_2^{n_{22}} \cdots F_1^{n_{r1}} F_2^{n_{r2}} \tag{5}$$

by iterated multiplication, which may be called *power products* of F_1 and F_2. We call

$$F_2^{-n_{r2}} F_1^{-n_{r2}} \cdots F_2^{-n_{22}} F_1^{-n_{21}} F_2^{-n_{12}} F_1^{-n_{11}} \tag{6}$$

the power product formally inverse to (5), because one computes that the product of (5) and (6) is equal to E. The power products of elements $F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_k$ may be constructed analogously.

If $F_1 F_2 = F_2 F_1$ for any two elements F_1 and F_2 of $\mathfrak{F}$ then the group $\mathfrak{F}$ is called *commutative*. If each element of $\mathfrak{F}$ may be written as a power of a fixed element F then $\mathfrak{F}$ is called a *cyclic* group with generator F. Since

$$F^n F^m = F^{n+m} = F^{m+n} = F^m F^n,$$

a cyclic group is commutative.

With a view towards our objectives we will always assume that the groups under consideration have only a denumerable number of elements. The number of elements of a group is called its *order*.

1.2 Cyclic Groups

Cylic groups are easy to exhibit. E.g., the positive and negative integers and zero constitute such a group when one takes addition as the group operation: all numbers may then be regarded as power products of $+1$ and -1.

The residue classes with respect to a modulus, under addition, constitute another example. If m is any positive integer we call two integers n_1 and n_2 congruent modulo m, denoted $n_1 \equiv n_2 \pmod{m}$, if the difference $n_1 - n_2$ is divisible by m. If

$$n_1 \equiv n_2 \pmod{m} \quad \text{and} \quad n_2 \equiv n_3 \pmod{m}$$

then also $n_1 \equiv n_3 \pmod{m}$.

We now understand the residue class $[n]$ to be all numbers congruent to $n \pmod{m}$. Obviously, the class $[n]$ is identical with the class $[n']$,

$$[n] = [n'], \quad \text{if} \quad n \equiv n' \pmod{m}$$

and conversely. For each residue class there is exactly one representative r satisfying the inequality

$$0 \leq r < m.$$

Thus there are m different residue classes.

We define an operation on these residue classes, denoted by the symbol $+$ and called addition, by

$$[n_1]+[n_2]=[n_1+n_2].$$

This definition is not contradictory. Namely, if $[n_i']=[n_i]$ then $n_i' \equiv n_i \pmod m$ $(i=1,2)$ and hence

$$n_1'+n_2' \equiv n_1+n_2 \pmod m,$$

as one easily verifies, so

$$[n_1+n_2]=[n_1'+n_2'].$$

This operation satisfies the group axioms. It is associative because addition of whole numbers is:

$$\begin{aligned}([n_1]+[n_2])+[n_3] &= [(n_1+n_2)+n_3] \\ &= [n_1+(n_2+n_3)] \\ &= [n_1]+([n_2]+[n_3]).\end{aligned}$$

$[0]$ is the identity element and $[-n]$ is the element inverse to $[n]$. The group is cyclic as well, because all m residue classes result from iterated addition of the residue class $[1]$.

The multiplication property of cyclic groups is easily seen to lead to the two examples given. If all elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ are powers F^n (where F is the generator of $\mathfrak{F}$) then either F^n is different from $F^{n'}$ as long as n is different from n'—in which case multiplication of elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ reduces to addition of whole numbers—or else there are two different exponents $n > n'$ which yield equal elements of $\mathfrak{F}$. Then

$$F^n F^{-n'} = F^{n-n'} = E$$

and there is a smallest positive exponent f for which

$$F^f = E.$$

In this case $F^n = F^{n'}$ if and only if $n \equiv n' \pmod f$. In fact

$$F^{kf} = (F^f)^k = E^k = E$$

and so $F^{n+kf} = F^n$. Conversely, if $F^n = F^{n'}$ $(n > n')$ then $F^{n-n'} = E$ Here we must have $n-n' \geq f$, and if

$$n-n' = kf+r \quad (0 \leq r < f)$$

then $F^r = 1$, so $r = 0$. In this case the cyclic group has order f.

1.3 Multiplication of Residue Classes

We can construct groups from the residue classes mod m in another way by taking the group operation to be multiplication of residue classes. The product of $[n_1]$ and $[n_2]$ is defined by

$$[n_1][n_2]=[n_1 n_2].$$

The product residue class is uniquely determined, because it follows from $[n_i'] = [n_i]$, or $n_i' \equiv n_i \pmod{m}$ $(i = 1,2)$, that $n_1' n_1' \equiv n_1 n_2 \pmod{m}$ also, and hence $[n_1' n_2'] = [n_1 n_2]$. This multiplication is associative and commutative, because multiplication of integers is. $[1]$ is the identity element because

$$[n][1] = [1][n] = [n].$$

On the other hand, there is not a multiplicative inverse for each residue class. Namely, if n is a number with which the modulus m has a greatest common divisor $d = (n,m) \neq 1$ then all numbers of the residue class $[n]$, the numbers $n + km$, have the same greatest common divisor in common with m:

$$(n + km, m) = (n,m) = d.$$

Obviously all numbers in the residue class $[n][n'] = [nn']$ then have a greatest divisor in common with m that is divisible by d and hence $\neq 1$. So it cannot be the case that $[n][n'] = [1]$.

However, it may be shown that *the residue classes* $[n]$ *for which the greatest common divisor*

$$d = (n,m) = 1$$

constitute a group under multiplication. The product of two residue classes relatively prime to m is again relatively prime to m. Further, if

$$[r_1], \quad [r_2], \quad \ldots, \quad [r_{\overline{m}}]$$

is the totality of these residue classes, and $[r]$ is any one of them, then

$$[rr_1], \quad [rr_2], \quad \ldots, \quad [rr_{\overline{m}}]$$

is again the totality of residue classes relatively prime to m. For if $[rr_i] = [rr_k]$ then $rr_i \equiv rr_k \pmod{m}$, so $r(r_i - r_k)$ must be divisible by m, or $r_i \equiv r_k \pmod{m}$, and

$$i = k.$$

The $\overline{m}$ residue classes $[rr_i]$ are therefore all different, and hence they exhaust the residue classes relatively prime to m.

Consequently, the residue class $[1]$ appears among the $[rr_i]$, and if

$$[rr'] = [1]$$

then $[r']$ is $[r]^{-1}$, the residue class inverse to $[r]$. The assertion now follows easily.

With a prime number p as modulus,

$$m = p,$$

the residue classes $[1], [2], [3], \ldots, [p-1]$ are relatively prime to p and so they constitute a group under the operation of residue class multiplication.

An interesting result on cyclic groups follows easily from our development. *If $\mathfrak{S}$ is a cyclic group with generator S and finite order m, then each element S^k with*

$$(k,m)=1$$

is a generator of the group; on the other hand, an element S^l with $(l,m)\neq 1$ does not generate the group. This is because the S^{ki} $(i=0,1,\ldots,m-1)$ are all different from each other, for it follows from $S^{ki_1}=S^{ki_2}$ that $ki_1\equiv ki_2 \pmod m$, so $k(i_1-i_2)$ must be divisible by m and hence $i_1=i_2$. The assertion about S^k then follows. On the other hand, the elements S^{li} correspond only to residue classes that have a common divisor with m greater than 1, and hence certainly not to all elements of the group.

The existence of the inverse residue class $[r]^{-1}$ can also be expressed as follows: if the greatest common divisor of n and m, $(n,m)=1$, then the congruence

$$nx\equiv 1 \pmod m$$

always has solutions, and indeed the set of solutions constitutes a residue class; namely, the residue class $[n]^{-1}$. It follows that a congruence

$$n_1x\equiv n_2 \pmod m \tag{1}$$

is always uniquely solvable if $(n_1,m)=1$, because an equivalent to (1) is

$$[n_1][x]=[n_2],$$

and from this we have $[x]=[n_1]^{-1}[n_2]$. I.e., there are solutions of the congruence (1), and the set of solutions is the congruence class $[n_1]^{-1}[n_2]$.

1.4 Groups of Transformations

One can take, as the elements of a group, the transformations of any domain $\mathfrak{X}$ of objects, with the composition of these transformations as the group operation. Let

$$\overline{x}=F(x)$$

be a one-to-one onto transformation of $\mathfrak{X}$; i.e., each object x corresponds to a well-defined object $\overline{x}$; all objects in $\mathfrak{X}$ appear among the $\overline{x}$; if x_1 and x_2 are different then so are $\overline{x_1}$ and $\overline{x_2}$. The inverse transformation F^{-1} is defined by

$$F^{-1}(\overline{x})=x,$$

and it is obviously also one-to-one and onto. If F_1 and F_2 are two one-to-one onto transformations, and if

$$\overline{x}=F_1(x),\quad \overline{\overline{x}}=F_2(\overline{x}),$$

then the correspondence $\overline{\overline{x}}=F_{21}(x)$ is again one-to-one. We call F_{21} the product of F_2 and F_1 and write $F_{21}=F_2F_1$. This operation satisfies the associative law. namely, if

$$\overline{x}=F_1(x),\quad x'=F_2(\overline{x}),\quad x^*=F_3(x')$$

then

$$x' = F_{21}(x), \quad x^* = F_{32}(\overline{x})$$

and hence

$$x^* = F_3(F_{21}(x)) = F_{32}(F_1(x))$$

is the same transformation of x.

Now *if $\mathfrak{F}$ is a family*[2] *of such one-to-one transformations and if $\mathfrak{F}$ contains, along with each member F, the inverse F^{-1} and, along with each pair F_1, F_2, their product F_{21}, then $\mathfrak{F}$ is obviously a group.*

If the domain $\mathfrak{X}$ consists of finitely many objects

$$x_1, \quad x_2, \quad \ldots, \quad x_m$$

then a one-to-one onto transformation

$$x_{n_i} = F(x_i) \qquad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$$

is called a permutation of the objects x_i.

If suitable transformations in a group $\mathfrak{F}$ will send any x to any other, then the transformation group is called *transitive*.

As an example of a transformation group we introduce the *modular* group. The domain $\mathfrak{X}$ consists of the complex numbers

$$x = \xi_1 + i\xi_2 \quad \text{with} \quad \xi_2 > 0$$

and the transformations are

$$x' = \frac{ax+b}{cx+d}, \tag{1}$$

where a, b, c, d are integers with determinant

$$ad - bc = 1.$$

If

$$x'' = \frac{a'x'+b'}{c'x'+d'} \tag{2}$$

is a second such transformation, then the composite transformation

$$x'' = \frac{a''x+b''}{c''x+d''} \tag{3}$$

has

$$\begin{aligned} a'' &= a'a + b'c, \qquad c'' = c'a + d'c, \\ b'' &= a'b + b'd, \qquad d'' = c'b + d'd. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The determinant $a''d'' - b''c''$ is equal to the product

$$(a'd' - b'c')(ad - bc) = 1.$$

[2]Strictly, a *nonempty* family, but Reidemeister always assumes nonempty sets. (Translator's note.)

$$x = \frac{d\,x' - b}{-c\,x' + a} \tag{5}$$

is the transformation inverse to (1). If (1) is the identity transformation then we must have

$$c\,x^2 - (d-a)x - b = 0$$

for all x. It follows that $b = c = d - a = 0$ and, because $a\,d = 1$, either $a = d = +1$ or $a = d = -1$. One sees from this that two transformations defined by the formula (1) are identical if and only if their coefficients a, b, c, d are respectively equal or else respectively of the same magnitude but oppositely signed.

1.5 Subgroups

In order to penetrate more deeply into the structure of a group $\mathfrak{F}$ one considers its subgroups, i.e., groups $\mathfrak{f}$ whose elements all belong to $\mathfrak{F}$. In this context the group operation for the elements of $\mathfrak{f}$ is the same as that for $\mathfrak{F}$. Thus $\mathfrak{F}$ itself is a subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}$. Each subgroup different from $\mathfrak{F}$ itself is called a *proper* subgroup. One can also characterize subgroups as follows: a collection $\mathfrak{f}$ of elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ is called a subgroup when

$$F_1 F_2 = F_{12}$$

belongs to $\mathfrak{f}$ along with F_1 and F_2 and, along with each element F, its inverse F^{-1} also belongs to $\mathfrak{f}$. Obviously the identity element $E = FF^{-1}$ then belongs to $\mathfrak{F}$ and, since the product of elements in $\mathfrak{f}$ is naturally associative, $\mathfrak{f}$ is in fact a group and hence a subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}$ according to the first definition.

The elements representable as powers of an element F constitute a subgroup, because the product of two powers of F and the inverse of a power are again powers of F. One calls the order of this subgroup the *order of the element* F. In the example of the whole numbers these groups consist of all the elements divisible by a given number.

One concludes similarly that the power products (5) in Section 1.1, of two or an arbitrary finite or infinite set of elements constitute a group. Thus if $\mathfrak{m}$ is any set of elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ one may speak of the subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}$ determined or *generated* by $\mathfrak{m}$. It is just the set of all power products of elements of $\mathfrak{m}$.

An important subgroup defined in this way is the *commutator group* $\mathfrak{K}_1$ of $\mathfrak{F}$. By the commutator of F_1 and F_2 we mean the element

$$K = F_1 F_2 F_1^{-1} F_2^{-1}.$$

Now if $\mathfrak{k}_1$ is the set of all commutator elements of $\mathfrak{F}$, then $\mathfrak{K}_1$ is the group generated by $\mathfrak{k}_1$. By the commutators of second order, $\mathfrak{k}_2$, we mean all commutators of an element of $\mathfrak{k}_1$ with an element of $\mathfrak{F}$, and by $\mathfrak{K}_2$ the group so generated, the *second commutator group*. Commutator groups of higher order may be defined by induction.

The elements F that commute with a fixed element F_0, i.e., those for which $F_0 F = F F_0$, constitute a group. For if

$$F_0 F_1 = F_1 F_0 \quad \text{and} \quad F_0 F_2 = F_2 F_0$$

then also

$$F_0F_1F_2 = F_1F_0F_2 = F_1F_2F_0$$

and

$$F_0F_1^{-1} = F_1^{-1}F_1F_0F_1^{-1} = F_1^{-1}F_0F_1F_1^{-1} = F_1^{-1}F_0.$$

Similarly, one concludes that the set $\mathfrak{Z}$ of those elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ that commute with all the elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ constitute a subgroup. It is called the *center* of $\mathfrak{F}$.

It is also easy to construct subgroups of a group of transformations. The set of all transformations that leave a given element x_0 fixed, e.g., constitute a subgroup. For if $F_1(x_0) = x_0$ and $F_2(x_0) = x_0$ then also

$$F_2(F_1(x_0)) = F_{21}(x_0) = x_0$$

and

$$F_1^{-1}(x_0) = x_0.$$

Similarly, the transformations that leave several points x fixed constitute a subgroup.

If $\mathfrak{f}_1$ and $\mathfrak{f}_2$ are subgroups of $\mathfrak{F}$, then so is the collection $\mathfrak{f}_{12}$ of all elements that belong to both $\mathfrak{f}_1$ and $\mathfrak{f}_2$. Namely, if F_1 and F_2 are elements that belong to both $\mathfrak{f}_1$ and $\mathfrak{f}_2$, then $F_1F_2 = F_{12}$ and F_1^{-1} also belong to both $\mathfrak{f}_1$ and $\mathfrak{f}_2$. One concludes similarly that the intersection of arbitrarily many subgroups is also a subgroup.

1.6 Conjugate Subgroups

If $\mathfrak{f}$ is a subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}$, $\overline{F}$ runs through all the elements of $\mathfrak{f}$, and F_0 is a fixed element of $\mathfrak{F}$, then the elements

$$F_0\overline{F}F_0^{-1} = \overline{F}'$$

run through a collection $\mathfrak{f}'$ of elements that also constitute a group. For if

$$\overline{F}_1\overline{F}_2 = \overline{F}_{12}$$

then

$$\overline{F}_1'\overline{F}_2' = F_0\overline{F}_1F_0^{-1}F_0\overline{F}_2F_0^{-1} = F_0\overline{F}_{12}F_0^{-1} = \overline{F}_{12}'$$

and $F_0\overline{F}^{-1}F_0^{-1}$ is the element inverse to $F_0\overline{F}F_0^{-1}$. We also write $F_0\mathfrak{f}F_0^{-1}$ for $\mathfrak{f}'$ and call it a *subgroup conjugate to* $\mathfrak{f}$.

If $\mathfrak{f}'$ is conjugate to $\mathfrak{f}$, then $\mathfrak{f}$ is also conjugate to $\mathfrak{f}'$. For in fact $F_0^{-1}\mathfrak{f}'F_0$ is identical with $\mathfrak{f}$. If $\mathfrak{f}_u$ is a proper subgroup of $\mathfrak{f}$, then $F_0\mathfrak{f}_uF_0^{-1}$ is a proper subgroup of $F_0\mathfrak{f}F_0^{-1}$.

If $\mathfrak{f}'$ and $\mathfrak{f}''$ are two subgroups conjugate to $\mathfrak{f}$, and if

$$\mathfrak{f}' = F_0\mathfrak{f}F_0^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{f}'' = F_0^{-1}\mathfrak{f}F_0,$$

and if both $\mathfrak{f}'$ and $\mathfrak{f}''$ are contained in $\mathfrak{f}$, then $\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{f}',\mathfrak{f}''$ are identical. E.g., if $\mathfrak{f}'$ were a proper subgroup of $\mathfrak{f}$ then we would also have

$$F_0^{-1}\mathfrak{f}'F_0 = \mathfrak{f}$$

a proper subgroup of

$$F_0^{-1}\mathfrak{f}F_0=\mathfrak{f}'';$$

thus $\mathfrak{f}=\mathfrak{f}''$ and consequently $\mathfrak{f}'=\mathfrak{f}$ also.

If F runs through all elements of $\mathfrak{F}$, then $F\mathfrak{f}F^{-1}$ runs through a *class of conjugate subgroups*. Such a class is determined by any one of its elements.

Naturally, it can happen that formally different conjugate subgroups are identical with each other. E.g., $F_0\mathfrak{f}F_0^{-1}$ is identical with $\mathfrak{f}$ when F_0 belongs to $\mathfrak{f}$. But the groups can also coincide when F_0 does not come from $\mathfrak{f}$. In particular, all conjugate subgroups can be identical with each other. Then $\mathfrak{f}$ is called an *invariant* subgroup.[3] Transformation groups yield examples of conjugate subgroups. If $\mathfrak{f}_x$ is the group of transformations that leave the element x fixed, and if $F_0(x)=\overline{x}$, then

$$F_0\mathfrak{f}F_0^{-1}=\mathfrak{f}_{\overline{x}}$$

is the group of transformations that leave $\overline{x}$ fixed. In fact, each transformation in $\mathfrak{f}_{\overline{x}}$ carries the object $\overline{x}$ back to itself. Conversely, if $F(\overline{x})=\overline{x}$ then

$$F_0^{-1}FF_0(x)=x$$

is a transformation F' in $\mathfrak{f}_x$, and then

$$F=F_0F'F_0^{-1}$$

belongs to $\mathfrak{f}_{\overline{x}}$. If $\mathfrak{F}$ is a transitive group, then the class of subgroups that leave some x fixed constitute a class of conjugate subgroups of $\mathfrak{F}$. If, for some x, $\mathfrak{f}_x$ consists only of the identity, then this is the case for all x, and the transformation group is called *simply transitive*.

Now for a few examples of invariant subgroups. The center $\mathfrak{Z}$ of the group $\mathfrak{F}$ is obviously an invariant subgroup; for if F is an arbitrary element of $\mathfrak{F}$ and Z is any element of the center, then always

$$FZF^{-1}=Z.$$

The commutator group $\mathfrak{K}_1$ is also an invariant subgroup. Namely, if K is the commutator

$$K=F_1F_2F_1^{-1}F_2^{-1}$$

then

$$FKF^{-1}=FF_1F^{-1}FF_2F^{-1}FF_1^{-1}F^{-1}FF_2^{-1}F^{-1}$$

is also a commutator. Consequently, for each product of commutators $K_1K_2\cdots K_r$ we also have

$$FK_1K_2\cdots K_rF^{-1}=FK_1F^{-1}FK_2F^{-1}\cdots FK_rF^{-1}$$

belonging to $\mathfrak{K}_1$. The higher commutator groups are also invariant subgroups.

[3] Of course, this is what we now call a *normal* subgroup. However, the word "invariant" is reasonable (if understood to mean "invariant under conjugation") and the word "normal" is overused in mathematics. So I have allowed "invariant" to stand. (Translator's note.)

The intersection $\mathfrak{D}$ of the subgroups in a class of conjugate subgroups is an invariant subgroup. Namely, if F^* is an element that appears in all groups $F\mathfrak{f}F^{-1}$ then the element $F_0F^*F_0^{-1}$ appears in all groups $F_0(F\mathfrak{f}F^{-1})F_0^{-1}$ and, since $F_0F=F'$ likewise runs through all elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ when F does, this means that $F_0F^*F_0^{-1}$ also appears in all groups $F\mathfrak{f}F^{-1}$.

1.7 Congruence Subgroups of the Modular Group

In the case of the modular group defined in Section 1.4, subgroups may be easily defined in terms of number-theoretic properties of the coefficients. E.g., the modular transformations with $c\equiv 0 \pmod n$ constitute a a group $\mathfrak{U}_n$. Namely, if

$$x'=\frac{ax+b}{cx+d} \quad \text{and} \quad x''=\frac{a'x'+b'}{c'x'+d'}$$

are two transformations with $c\equiv c'\equiv 0 \pmod n$, then for the composite transformation

$$x''=\frac{a''x+b''}{c''x+d''}$$

we have $c''=c'a+d'c$, which is obviously divisible by n, so $c''\equiv 0 \pmod n$ as well. If

$$x=\frac{a'x'+b'}{c'x'+d'}$$

is the transformation inverse to $x'=\frac{ax+b}{cx+d}$, then by (5) of Section 1.4, $c'=-c$, so likewise $c'\equiv 0 \pmod n$.

Another *"congruence subgroup"* $\mathfrak{U}'_n$ consists of all the modular substitutions with $b\equiv 0 \pmod n$. One can either verify the group property of $\mathfrak{U}'_n$ directly, or else confirm that $\mathfrak{U}'_n$ is identical with a group conjugate to $\mathfrak{U}_n$. Namely, if one denotes the transformation

$$x'=-\frac{1}{x}$$

by S, then the group

$$S\mathfrak{U}_nS^{-1}=S\mathfrak{U}_nS$$

consists of the transformations

$$x'=-\frac{c\left(-\frac{1}{x}\right)+d}{a\left(-\frac{1}{x}\right)+b}=\frac{dx-c}{-bx+a} \tag{1}$$

with $c\equiv 0 \pmod n$. These transformations obviously all belong to $\mathfrak{U}'_n$, and since one confirms similarly that $S\mathfrak{U}'_nS^{-1}$ is contained in $\mathfrak{U}_n$, we have $\mathfrak{U}'_n=S\mathfrak{U}_nS$.

The modular transformations with

$$a\equiv d\equiv 1 \pmod n, \qquad b\equiv c\equiv 0 \pmod n$$

likwise constitute a group $\mathfrak{I}_n$. For, along with each transformation, the inverse also belongs to $\mathfrak{I}_n$, by (5) in Section 1.4, and if (1) and (2) in Section 1.4 are two transformations in $\mathfrak{I}_n$, then the composite transformation (3) in Section 1.4 satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} a'' &= a'a + b'c \equiv a'a \equiv 1 \pmod{n} \\ d'' &= c'b + d'd \equiv d'd \equiv 1 \pmod{n} \\ b'' &= a'b + b'd \equiv 0 \pmod{n} \\ c'' &= c'a + d'c \equiv 0 \pmod{n}. \end{aligned}$$

In contrast to the $\mathfrak{U}_n$, the $\mathfrak{I}_n$ are invariant subgroups.

$$\mathfrak{I}'_n = S\mathfrak{I}_n S^{-1} = S^{-1}\mathfrak{I}_n S$$

is contained in $\mathfrak{I}_n$ by formula (1) and the assumptions

$$a \equiv d \equiv 1 \pmod{n}, \qquad b \equiv c \equiv 0 \pmod{n}.$$

In addition, we construct

$$T^\eta \mathfrak{I}_n T^{-\eta} \qquad (\eta = \pm 1),$$

where T denotes the transformation

$$x' = x + 1.$$

This group consists of the transformations

$$x' = \frac{(a + c\eta)x + (d - a)\eta + b - c}{cx - c\eta + d}$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} a + c\eta \equiv -c\eta + d \equiv 1 \pmod{n} \\ (d - a)\eta + b - c \equiv c \equiv 0 \pmod{n}, \end{aligned}$$

so these transformations belong to $\mathfrak{I}_n$. Consequently, the groups

$$T^\eta \mathfrak{I}_n T^{-\eta} \quad \text{and} \quad S\mathfrak{I}_n S$$

are identical with $\mathfrak{I}_n$ by the third paragraph of Section 1.6. Since we will see in Section 2.9 that all modular substitutions may be written as power products of S and T, the invariance of $\mathfrak{I}_n$ follows.

1.8 Residue Classes modulo Subgroups

The method of constructing residue classes in the domain of integers may be extended to arbitrary groups. If $\mathfrak{F}$ is a group and $\mathfrak{f}$ is a subgroup, we call two elements F_1 and F_2 right congruent modulo $\mathfrak{f}$, written

$$F_1 \equiv_r F_2 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}},$$

if there is an element F_f of $\mathfrak{f}$ such that $F_1 = F_2 F_f$. If

$$F_1 \equiv_r F_2 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}} \qquad \text{then also} \qquad F_2 \equiv_r F_1 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}},$$

because in fact $F_2 = F_1 F_f^{-1}$. And if

$$F_1 \equiv_r F_2 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad F_2 \equiv_r F_3 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}}$$

then also

$$F_1 \equiv_r F_3 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}},$$

because if $F_1 = F_2 F_f$ and $F_2 = F_3 F_{f'}$ then $F_1 = F_3 F_{f'} F_f = F_3 F_{f''}$. We understand the right-sided residue class[4] determined by F_1 to be the collection $F_1\mathfrak{f}$ of elements right congruent to F_1 modulo $\mathfrak{f}$. If $F_1 \equiv_r F_2 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}}$ then

$$F_1\mathfrak{f} = F_2\mathfrak{f},$$

and conversely. The residue class is determined by any one of its elements, or in other words: two right-sided residue classes modulo $\mathfrak{f}$ that have a common element are identical. Thus the elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ are partitioned by a subgroup into disjoint residue classes. A *system of representatives* of these residue classes is a set $\mathfrak{r}$ of elements R of the following kind: if F is any element of $\mathfrak{F}$ then there is an element R of $\mathfrak{r}$ such that

$$F \equiv_r R \pmod{\mathfrak{f}},$$

and if R_1 and R_2 are two elements of $\mathfrak{r}$ then R_1 is not right congruent to R_2. The classes $R\mathfrak{f}$ then yield all the residue classes, without repetitions, as R runs through $\mathfrak{r}$.

We can define left congruence analogously to right congruence. We say

$$F_1 \equiv_l F_2 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}}$$

if $F_1 = F_f F_2$, where F_f belongs to $\mathfrak{f}$. We analogously define the left-sided residue classes and a system of representatives $\mathfrak{r}'$ of them. We will show: *if $\mathfrak{r}$ is a full system of representatives for the right-sided residue classes, then $\mathfrak{r}^{-1}$, the collection of inverses to the R in $\mathfrak{r}$, is a left-sided system of representatives.* Namely, if F is an arbitrary element and $F^{-1} = R F_f$, then $F = F_f^{-1} R^{-1}$, so

$$F \equiv_l R^{-1} \pmod{\mathfrak{f}}.$$

Further, if

$$R_1^{-1} \equiv_l R_2^{-1}, \quad \text{so} \quad R_1^{-1} = F_f R_2^{-1},$$

then $R_2 \equiv_r R_1 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}}$.

If the number of right-sided residue classes modulo $\mathfrak{f}$ is a finite number n, then this shows that the number of left-sided residue classes is also n.

$R\mathfrak{f}R^{-1}$ runs through all subgroups conjugate to $\mathfrak{f}$ as R runs through the set $\mathfrak{r}$. For if F_0 is an element of $\mathfrak{F}$ and $F_0 = R_0 F_f$ then

$$F_0\mathfrak{f}F_0^{-1} = R_0 F_f \mathfrak{f} F_f^{-1} R_0^{-1} = R_0 \mathfrak{f} R_0^{-1}.$$

[4] This residue class if of course what we now call a *coset* of the subgroup $\mathfrak{f}$. However, I have thought it best to retain the term "residue class " (in German, Restklasse) to reflect Reidemeister's view of cosets as generalizations of residue classes in number theory. (Translator's note.)

1.9 Residue Classes modulo Congruence Subgroups of the Modular Group

As an example, we determine the left-sided residue classes modulo the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}_n$ of the modular group defined in Section 1.7, for n equal to a prime number p.

If we denote the transformation

$$x' = \frac{-1}{x+k}$$

by G_k, then the identity transformation E and the G_k $(k = 0, 1, \ldots, p-1)$ form a full system of representatives for the $\mathfrak{U}_p M$, where M denotes an arbitrary modular substitution. Namely, for each M that does not belong to $\mathfrak{U}_p$ (that is, $c \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$) we may determine a substitution U in $\mathfrak{U}_p$

$$x' = \frac{a'x + b'}{c'x + d'},$$

so $c' \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, and a G_k so that

$$UG_k = M.$$

If the substitution MG_k^{-1} is given by

$$x'' = \frac{a''x + b''}{c''x + d''},$$

then by (4) of Section 1.4

$$c'' = kc - d.$$

Thus k must satisfy the congruence

$$kc - d \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

and then by Section 1.3 the residue class $[k]$ is uniquely determined, because c is assumed to be relatively prime to p and hence k is also, because

$$0 \leq k < p.$$

But then the coefficients of U are likewise determined by

$$U = MG_k^{-1}.$$

1.10 Factor Groups

The definition of addition of residue classes can also be generalized under the hypothesis that the modulus $\mathfrak{f}$ is an invariant subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}$. One sees first of all that: *if* $\mathfrak{f}$ *is an invariant subgroup and if*

$$F_1 \equiv_r F_2 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}}$$

then also

$$F_1 \equiv_l F_2 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}}$$

and conversely. For if

$$F_1 = F_2 F_f = F_2 F_f F_2^{-1} F_2$$

and $\mathfrak{f}$ is invariant, then $F_1 = F_f' F_2$, because $F_2 \mathfrak{f} F_2^{-1} = \mathfrak{f}$ and so $F_2 F_f F_2^{-1}$ is itself an element of $\mathfrak{f}$. Thus we can simply speak of residue classes modulo $\mathfrak{f}$. Now we can show further that if

$$F_1 \equiv F_2 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad F_1' \equiv F_2' \pmod{\mathfrak{f}}$$

then $F_1 F_1' \equiv F_2 F_2' \pmod{\mathfrak{f}}$ as well. For if $F_1 = F_2 F_f$ and $F_1' = F_2' F_f'$ then

$$F_1 F_1' = F_2 F_2' F_2'^{-1} F_f F_2' F_f' = F_2 F_2' F_f'' F_f'.$$

If now $F_1\mathfrak{f}$ and $F_2\mathfrak{f}$ are two residue classes, we define their product to be the residue class $F_1 F_2 \mathfrak{f}$. By what has just been proved, this multiplication is independent of the choice of F_i from $F_i\mathfrak{f}$.

The residue classes form a group under the product defined in this way. The product is associative, because that for the F is; $F^{-1}\mathfrak{f}$ is the element inverse to $F\mathfrak{f}$, and $E\mathfrak{f} = \mathfrak{f}$ is the identity element. This group is called the *factor group* of $\mathfrak{F}$ by $\mathfrak{f}$. We denote if by $\mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{f}$.

We want to construct the factor group by the commutator group $\mathfrak{K}_1 = \mathfrak{K}$ and show that it is commutative. We have to show that

$$F_1\mathfrak{K} \cdot F_2\mathfrak{K} = F_2\mathfrak{K} \cdot F_1\mathfrak{K}.$$

But now

$$F_1\mathfrak{K} \cdot F_2\mathfrak{K} \cdot F_1^{-1}\mathfrak{K} \cdot F_2^{-1}\mathfrak{K} = F_1 F_2 F_1^{-1} F_2^{-1}\mathfrak{K} = \mathfrak{K},$$

because $F_1 F_2 F_1^{-1} F_2^{-1}$ is the commutator of F_1 and F_2.

1.11 Isomorphisms

Two different groups may possess the same product structure. One captures this relation more precisely by an isomorphic correspondence between the two groups. *If $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{F}'$ are two groups, and if $F' = \boldsymbol{I}(F)$ is a one-to-one correspondence between the elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{F}'$ such that*

$$\boldsymbol{I}(F_1)\boldsymbol{I}(F_2) = \boldsymbol{I}(F_1 F_2),$$

then the group $\mathfrak{F}'$ is called isomorphic to $\mathfrak{F}$ and the mapping $\boldsymbol{I}$ is called an isomorphism. If we drop the condition that $\boldsymbol{I}$ sends different elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ to different elements of $\mathfrak{F}'$, then $\mathfrak{F}'$ is called *homomorphic* to $\mathfrak{F}'$ and the mapping $\boldsymbol{I}$ is called a *homomorphism.*

A factor group $\mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{f}$ is homomorphic to $\mathfrak{F}$. Namely, if we set $\boldsymbol{I}(F) = F\mathfrak{f}$ this is in fact a homomorphism, not one-to-one unless $\mathfrak{f}$ consists of a single element, the identity

element. In this case the elements F that form the identity element of $\mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{f}$ are just those that make up $\mathfrak{f}$.

Conversely, if $\boldsymbol{I}(F)=F'$ is a homomorphism, then the identity element of $\mathfrak{F}$ must be associated with the identity of $\mathfrak{F}'$, i.e., $\boldsymbol{I}(E)=E'$, because indeed

$$\boldsymbol{I}(E)\boldsymbol{I}(F)=\boldsymbol{I}(F)\boldsymbol{I}(E)=\boldsymbol{I}(F).$$

Consequently, $\boldsymbol{I}(F)$ is inverse to $\boldsymbol{I}(F^{-1})$, because

$$\boldsymbol{I}(F)\boldsymbol{I}(F^{-1})=\boldsymbol{I}(E)=E'.$$

We now take $\mathfrak{f}$ to be the collection of elements F of $\mathfrak{F}$ for which $\boldsymbol{I}(F)=E'$. They form a group, because if

$$\boldsymbol{I}(F_1)=\boldsymbol{I}(F_2)=E'$$

then also

$$\boldsymbol{I}(F_1F_2)=E'.$$

And since

$$\boldsymbol{I}(F_1)\boldsymbol{I}(F_1^{-1})=E'\boldsymbol{I}(F_1^{-1})=\boldsymbol{I}(F_1^{-1})$$

and, on the other hand,

$$\boldsymbol{I}(F_1)\boldsymbol{I}(F_1^{-1})=\boldsymbol{I}(F_1F_1^{-1})=E',$$

F_1^{-1} belongs to this collection along with F_1. Finally, $\mathfrak{f}$ is an invariant subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}$. Indeed,

$$\boldsymbol{I}(FF_1F^{-1})=\boldsymbol{I}(F)E'\boldsymbol{I}(F^{-1})=E'.$$

It follows easily from this that $\boldsymbol{I}$ associates all elements of a residue class $F\mathfrak{f}$ with the same F' and hence it realizes an isomorphism between $\mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{f}$ and $\mathfrak{F}'$.

From Section 1.2 it follows that cyclic groups of the same order are isomorphic.

1.12 Automorphisms

A one-to-one onto transformation of a group $\mathfrak{F}$ into itself,

$$F'=\boldsymbol{I}(F),$$

is called an autoisomorphism, or simply *automorphism*, when

$$\boldsymbol{I}(F_1)\boldsymbol{I}(F_2)=\boldsymbol{I}(F_1F_2).$$

The automorphisms of a group $\mathfrak{F}$ constitute a group. For the identity mapping is obviously an automorphism, likewise the inverse $\boldsymbol{I}^{-1}$ of an automorphism. Namely, if $F_1'F_2'=F_3'$ and $F_i'=\boldsymbol{I}(F_i)$, so that $\boldsymbol{I}^{-1}(F_i')=F_i$ and $\boldsymbol{I}(F_1)\boldsymbol{I}(F_2)=\boldsymbol{I}(F_3)$ then

$$\boldsymbol{I}(F_1F_2)=\boldsymbol{I}(F_3)$$

because $\boldsymbol{I}$ is an automorphism. Thus $F_1F_2 = F_3$ because $\boldsymbol{I}$ is one-to-one, and since $F_i = \boldsymbol{I}^{-1}(F_i')$ it follows that

$$\boldsymbol{I}^{-1}(F_1')\boldsymbol{I}^{-1}(F_2') = \boldsymbol{I}^{-1}(F_3').$$

Further, if $\boldsymbol{I}_1(F) = F'$ and $\boldsymbol{I}_2(F) = F''$ are automorphisms then

$$F'' = \boldsymbol{I}_2(\boldsymbol{I}_1(F)) = \boldsymbol{I}_{21}(F)$$

is likewise an automorphism, because

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{I}_{21}(F_1)\boldsymbol{I}_{21}(F_2) &= \boldsymbol{I}_2(\boldsymbol{I}_1(F_1)\boldsymbol{I}_1(F_2)) \\ &= \boldsymbol{I}_2(\boldsymbol{I}_1(F_1F_2)) \\ &= \boldsymbol{I}_{21}(F_1F_2).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the product is associative because it is the composition of functions.

It is easy to exhibit particular automorphisms. If F_0 is a fixed element of $\mathfrak{F}$ and F runs through all the elements of $\mathfrak{F}$, then

$$F' = F_0FF_0^{-1}$$

is a one-to-one onto transformation of group elements because

$$F_0^{-1}F'F_0 = F$$

is the inverse mapping, and also

$$F_0F_1F_0^{-1} \cdot F_0F_2F_0^{-1} = F_0F_1F_2F_0^{-1}.$$

Such a mapping is called an *inner automorphism*. If F_0 runs through all elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ we obtain the totality of inner automorphisms of $\mathfrak{F}$. They constitute a group that is homomorphic to $\mathfrak{F}$ itself. The product of two inner automorphisms

$$F' = F_1FF_1^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad F'' = F_2F'F_2^{-1}$$

is another, namely,

$$F'' = F_2F_1FF_1^{-1}F_2^{-1} = F_{21}FF_{21}^{-1}.$$

In order to ascertain whether the homomorphism from $\mathfrak{F}$ to the group of its inner automorphisms is one-to-one we must establish which inner automorphisms correspond to the identity mapping—but these are just those defined by elements belonging to the center of $\mathfrak{F}$. The group of inner automorphisms is therefore isomorphic to the factor group $\mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{Z}$.

The inner automorphisms are an invariant subgroup of all the automorphisms. Namely, if

$$\boldsymbol{A}(F) = F^*$$

is an arbitrary automorphism, and

$$\boldsymbol{I}(F) = F' = F_0FF_0^{-1}$$

is an inner automorphism, then

$$\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{I}(F)) = \boldsymbol{A}(F_0)\boldsymbol{A}(F)\boldsymbol{A}(F_0^{-1}) = F_0^* F^* F_0^{*-1}.$$

Thus if we set

$$\boldsymbol{I}'(F^*) = \overline{F} = F_0^* F^* F_0^{*-1} = F_0^* \boldsymbol{A}(F) F_0^{*-1}$$

then

$$\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{I}(F)) = \boldsymbol{I}'(\boldsymbol{A}(F))$$

so

$$\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{I} = \boldsymbol{I}'\boldsymbol{A} \quad \text{or} \quad \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{I}\boldsymbol{A}^{-1} = \boldsymbol{I}'.$$

If $\mathfrak{f}$ is an invariant subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}$ and F_0 is any element of $\mathfrak{F}$, then the mapping

$$F_0 F F_0^{-1} = F'$$

is an automorphism of $\mathfrak{f}$. If F_0 itself belongs to $\mathfrak{f}$, then it is an inner automorphism. The totality of automorphisms induced by elements F_0 of $\mathfrak{F}$ constitute a subgroup of all the automorphisms of $\mathfrak{f}$. The elements of a residue class $F_0\mathfrak{f}$ modulo $\mathfrak{f}$ correspond to automorphisms resulting from multiplication by inner automorphisms.

One can see from these remarks that any group can be embedded as an invariant subgroup of a larger group. We want to formulate the situation as follows: given a group $\mathfrak{f}$ and its product operation, together with a system $\mathfrak{r}$ of representatives of residue classes of $\mathfrak{F}$ modulo $\mathfrak{f}$, one then knows that each element of $\mathfrak{F}$ may be written as a product RF, where R is from $\mathfrak{r}$ and F is from $\mathfrak{f}$. In order to extend the group product to all of $\mathfrak{F}$, i.e, to know the value of the product

$$R_1 F_1 R_2 F_2 = R_1 R_2 R_1^{-1} F_1 R_2 F_2,$$

we must first know the automorphisms of $\mathfrak{f}$ corresponding to the elements R and also, for any two elements R_1, R_2, the product $R_{12}F_{12}$. Then the group $\mathfrak{F}$ itself will be known.

1.13 Groups with Operators

When a group $\mathfrak{F}$ with a cyclic group of automorphisms $\boldsymbol{A}^n$ is given[5] we can make the structure connecting these two domains of elements clearer by means of a new symbolism, which is particularly convenient in the case of a commutative group $\mathfrak{F}$. So we will assume that $\mathfrak{F}$ is commutative. By F^x we will mean the element $\boldsymbol{A}(F)$ and by F^{x^n} the element $\boldsymbol{A}^n(F)$ $(n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots)$. For any integer a_n, $F^{a_n x^n}$ means $(F^{a_n})^{x^n}$.

If

$$f(x) = a_n x^n + a_{n+1} x^{n+1} + \cdots + a_{n+m} x^{n+m}$$

[5] That is, consisting of the powers of an automorphism $\boldsymbol{A}$. (Translator's note.)

is an "L-polynomial,"[6] with integral coefficients a_i, then by $F^{f(x)}$ we mean the element

$$F^{f(x)} = F^{a_n x^n} F^{a_{n+1} x^{n+1}} \cdots F^{a_{n+m} x^{n+m}}$$

One can compute in this extended domain of exponents as in the original domain of integers. We call two polynomials equal if they are convertible into each other by deletion or insertion of terms $a_i x^i$ with $a_i = 0$. If $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are two polynomials and n is the lowest, and $n+m$ the highest exponent of an x^i appearing in f and g along with a_i or $b_i \neq 0$, then

$$f(x) = a_n x^n + a_{n+1} x^{n+1} + \cdots + a_{n+m} x^{n+m}$$
$$g(x) = b_n x^n + b_{n+1} x^{n+1} + \cdots + b_{n+m} x^{n+m}.$$

As usual, we understand the sum of $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ to be the polynomial

$$f(x) + g(x) = \sum_{i=n}^{n+m} (a_i + b_i) x^i.$$

This addition operation satisfies the laws of a commutative group, because the integers under addition are such a group. The polynomial $f = 0$ plays the role of the identity element.

We understand the product of $f(x)$ and bx^l to be the polynomial

$$a_n b x^{n+l} + a_{n+1} b x^{n+1+l} + \cdots + a_{n+m} b x^{n+m+l}$$

and as usual we understand the product of $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ to be the polynomial

$$fg = f(x) b_n x^n + f(x) b_{n+1} x^{n+1} + \cdots + f(x) b_{n+m} x^{n+m}.$$

This multiplication is associative and commutative; $f(x) = 1$ is the identity element. However, an inverse element does not exist in general; e.g., the polynomial $f(x) = a$ has no inverse when $a \neq \pm 1$, because the coefficients of all products $a \cdot f(x)$ are divisible by a. The multiplication and addition are further related by the distributive law:

$$(f_1(x) + f_2(x)) g(x) = f_1(x) g(x) + f_2(x) g(x).$$

If $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are two polynomials, both nonzero, and if $a_n x^n$ and $b_m x^m$ are the lowest-order terms appearing in $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ with $a_n \neq 0$ and $b_m \neq 0$, then the lowest-order term appearing in $f(x)g(x)$ is $a_n b_m x^{n+m}$. It follows from this that if $f(x)g(x) = 0$ then at least one of the factors $f(x)$ or $g(x)$ equals zero. Thus the polynomials constitute an integral domain.[7]

If the smallest exponent in a polynomial $f(x)$ is greater than or equal to zero then $f(x)$ is an ordinary[8] polynomial in x. For any ordinary polynomial

$$f(x) = a_n x^n + a_{n+1} x^{n+1} + \cdots + a_{n+m} x^{n+m}$$

[6] The L presumably stands for "Laurent," since these polynomials can have terms with negative exponent. (Translator's note.)

[7] See a textbook of algebra, e.g., H. HASSE *Höhere Algebra*, Band 1, Sammlung Göschen.

[8] Reidemeister calls such a polynomial *entire*, following the terminology of complex analysis. But it seems harmless, and clearer, to call such polynomials "ordinary." (Translator's note.)

with $a_n \neq 0$

$$x^{-n} f(x) = a_n + a_{n+1}x + \cdots + a_{n+m}x^m$$

is an ordinary polynomial with nonzero constant term.

If we now consider $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ as exponents of group elements, it turns out that

$$F^{f(x)}F^{g(x)} = F^{f(x)+g(x)}.$$

This follows easily from the commutativity of the group and the definition of $F^{f(x)}$ and $f(x)+g(x)$. Further,

$$(F^{f(x)})^{g(x)} = F^{f(x)g(x)},$$

because

$$(F^{f(x)})^{g(x)} = (F^{f(x)})^{b_n x^n}(F^{f(x)})^{b_{n+1}x^{n+1}} \cdots (F^{f(x)})^{b_{n+m}x^{n+m}}.$$

Then, on the one hand,

$$(F^{f(x)})^{b_i} = F^{b_i f(x)}$$

since

$$(F^{f(x)})^{b_i} = F^{f(x)}F^{f(x)} \cdots F^{f(x)} \quad \text{with } b_i \text{ factors}$$

for positive b_i, and for negative b_i

$$(F^{f(x)})^{b_i} = \left((F^{f(x)})^{-1}\right)^{-b_i} = \left(F^{-f(x)}\right)^{-b_i}.$$

While, on the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}(F^{f(x)})^{x^i} &= \left(F^{a_n x^n} F^{a_{n+1}x^{n+1}} \cdots F^{a_{n+m}x^{n+m}}\right)^{x^i} \\ &= \left(F^{a_n x^n}\right)^{x^i} \left(F^{a_{n+1}x^{n+1}}\right)^{x^i} \cdots \left(F^{a_{n+m}x^{n+m}}\right)^{x^i} \\ &= (F^{a_n})^{x^{n+i}} (F^{a_{n+1}})^{x^{n+1+i}} \cdots (F^{a_{n+m}})^{x^{n+m+i}} \\ &= F^{x^i f(x)}.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $(F^{f(x)})^{b_i x^i} = F^{b_i x^i f(x)}$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned}(F^{f(x)})^{g(x)} &= F^{b_n x^n f(x)} F^{b_{n+1}x^{n+1}f(x)} \cdots F^{b_{n+m}x^{n+m}f(x)} \\ &= F^{b_n x^n f(x) + b_{n+1}x^{n+1} + \cdots + b_{n+m}x^{n+m}f(x)} \\ &= F^{f(x)g(x)}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus one can compute with the formally introduced L-polynomials as exponents just as with integral exponents.

1.14 Groups and Transformation Groups

We call a transformation group $\mathfrak{T}$ that is homomorphic to an arbitrary group $\mathfrak{F}$ a representation of $\mathfrak{F}$, and we further examine the different representations of a group.

We take as our domain $\mathfrak{X}$ of objects the right-sided residue classes modulo a subgroup $\mathfrak{f}$, so $x = R\mathfrak{f}$, and define

$$F(x) = FR\mathfrak{f} = x'$$

to be the transformation of this domain corresponding to the group element F.

This mapping is one-to-one and onto, because F^{-1} yields the inverse mapping. The transformations that carry the element $x = \mathfrak{f}$ into itself are exactly those that correspond to elements of $\mathfrak{f}$. The transformations that carry $R\mathfrak{f}$ to itself correspond to the elements of the group $R\mathfrak{f}R^{-1}$ conjugate to $\mathfrak{f}$. We can now easily give a criterion for isomorphism between $\mathfrak{F}$ and the group just defined.

Those elements that correspond to transformations leaving all x fixed must therefore belong to the intersection $\mathfrak{D}$ of the groups $R\mathfrak{f}R^{-1}$ conjugate to $\mathfrak{F}$. The group $\mathfrak{T}$ is therefore isomorphic to the factor group $\mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{D}$.

If $\mathfrak{f}$ is an invariant subgroup, then the transformations that correspond to $\mathfrak{f}$, and thus carry the element $x = \mathfrak{f}$ to itself, also carry all the remaining x to themselves, because $\mathfrak{D}$ in this case is equal to $\mathfrak{f}$. The transformation group is then simply transitive.

Conversely, given any simply transitive group of transformations isomorphic to $\mathfrak{F}$, an arbitrary element x_0, and $\mathfrak{f}_{x_0}$ the subgroup of transformations that leave x_0 fixed, the transformations that carry x_0 to x constitute a residue class modulo $\mathfrak{f}_{x_0}$. Namely, if R_x carries the element x_0 to x, so also do the transformations in $R_x\mathfrak{f}_{x_0}$, and if R' is any transformation that carries x_0 to x, then $R_x^{-1}R'$ carries the element x_0 to itself and it therefore belongs to $\mathfrak{f}_{x_0}$.

If we associate with each group element

$$F(x) = x'$$

the transformation

$$F(R_x\mathfrak{f}_{x_0}) = FR_x\mathfrak{f}_{x_0}$$

in the domain of residue classes, then

$$FR_x\mathfrak{f}_{x_0} = R_{x'}\mathfrak{f}_{x_0}.$$

Thus the new transformation group is simply the original one with renaming of the objects transformed. A representation of a group $\mathfrak{F}$ by a transitive transformation group is an isomorphism, by the remarks above, if and only if the domain of objects can be viewed as a system of right-sided residue classes modulo a subgroup $\mathfrak{f}$, where the intersection of $\mathfrak{f}$ with its conjugate subgroups is the identity.

1.15 The Groupoid

For many topological questions a generalization of the group concept, the groupoid,[9] is a useful auxiliary.

A collection $\mathfrak{G}$ of elements G with a product $G_1G_2 = G_3$ is called a *groupoid* when the following conditions are satisfied.

[9] H. BRANDT, Math. Ann. **96**, 360.

A. 1. *If a relation $G_1G_2 = G_3$ holds between three elements G_1, G_2, G_3, then each of them is uniquely determined by the other two.*

A. 2. *If G_1G_2 and G_2G_3 exist then $(G_1G_2)G_3$ and $G_1(G_2G_3)$ also exist; if G_1G_2 and $(G_1G_2)G_3$ exist then G_2G_3 and $G_1(G_2G_3)$ also exist; if G_2G_3 and $G_1(G_2G_3)$ exist then G_1G_2 and $(G_1G_2)G_3$ also exist; and in each case $(G_1G_2)G_3 = G_1(G_2G_3)$, so that it can also be written $G_1G_2G_3$.*

A. 3. *For each element G the following elements exist: the right identity E, the left identity E', and the inverse G^{-1}, for which the following relations hold:*

$$GE = G, \quad E'G = G, \quad G^{-1}G = E.$$

A. 4. *For any two identities E, E' there is an element G for which E is the right identity and E' is the left identity.*

One sees that the generalization consists in relinquishing general applicability of the product and admitting several identities. Groupoids with a single identity are groups.

Just as in Section 1.1, one can prove the appropriate analogue of the associative law for the product of arbitrarily many elements.

Two elements G_1 and G_2 are composable in that order if and only if the right identity of G_1 is identical with the left identity of G_2. The subclass $\mathfrak{G}_i$ of elements G for which the right and left identities both equal E_i constitute a group. The groups $\mathfrak{G}_i$ associated with different identities are isomorphic.

An example of a groupoid may be constructed from a group $\mathfrak{T}$ of transformations T of objects x, which carry the object x_1 in particular into finitely many objects

$$x_1, \quad x_2, \quad \ldots, \quad x_n.$$

The groupoid then has n corresponding identities $E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_n$; also, for each element G of the groupoid there is an associated element $\boldsymbol{A}(G) = T$, where T is a transformation carrying x_a to x_b if G has left identity E_a and right identity E_b and, conversely, for each such element T there is an element G with the corresponding identities. One observes that an element T corresponds to n different G, because T permutes the x_i among themselves. Also, it it the case that

$$\boldsymbol{A}(G_1G_2) = \boldsymbol{A}(G_1)\boldsymbol{A}(G_2).$$

A groupoid is uniquely determined by these conditions. The groups corresponding to the identities are isomorphic to the subgroups of $\mathfrak{T}$ that leave the x_i fixed.

Chapter 2

Free Groups and their Factor Groups

2.1 Generators and Defining Relations

The groups that appear in combinatorial topology are defined in a way that itself has a combinatorial character. The peculiar difficulties of topology can be better appreciated when one has at hand the analogous problems of group theory, which we are about to present.

If $\mathfrak{F}$ is any group and $\mathfrak{m}$ is a class of elements from which all elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ may be constructed as power products, then $\mathfrak{m}$ is called a *system of generators* for the group $\mathfrak{F}$. Thus a system of generators for the integers is just 1, and for an additive residue class group it is the class [1]. These examples already draw attention to the fact that formally different power products can yield the same group element. If one wants to be able to derive the product of elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ from the product of power products, then one must be able to decide which power products represent equal group elements. This reduces to the question of which products represent the identity element.[1]

We call each product $R(\mathfrak{m})$ of elements of $\mathfrak{m}$ that equals the identity a relation, and call the totality of relations $\mathfrak{R}$. Now if P is any power product and R is any relation, then obviously P and PR are the same group element

$$P = PR.$$

Conversely, if P_1 and P_2 are two power products that denote the same group element, and if P_1^{-1} is the product formally inverse to P_1, then $P_1^{-1}P_2$ is a relation R', and the power product P_2 results from the product P_1R' by deletion of adjacent factors FF^{-1}. We thus obtain all representations of the element P in the form PR when R runs through the class $\mathfrak{R}$, if we also include those products that result from deletion of formally inverse adjacent factors of PR.

[1] The so-called *word problem* for the group $\mathfrak{F}$. (Translator's note.)

The power products of $\mathfrak{R}$ have the following properties.

If $R = P_1P_2$ belongs to $\mathfrak{R}$, so does $R' = P_1FF^{-1}P_2$, and conversely, if R' belongs to $\mathfrak{R}$ so does R. If R belongs to $\mathfrak{R}$, so does the formal inverse R^{-1}. If P is an arbitrary power product, P^{-1} its formal inverse, and if R belongs to $\mathfrak{R}$, then PRP^{-1} also belongs to $\mathfrak{R}$. If R_1 and R_2 belong to $\mathfrak{R}$, then the product R_1R_2 also belongs to $\mathfrak{R}$. By means of these four processes, "consequence relations" may be derived from relations originally given. We call a class $\mathfrak{r}$ of defining relations from which all relations in $\mathfrak{R}$ may be derived by the four processes a *system of defining relations*. With a class $\mathfrak{m}$ of generators and a class $\mathfrak{r}$ of defining relations the product law is obviously defined for all elements of $\mathfrak{F}$, hence the name "defining relations." Establishing generators and defining relations for groups given in other ways is a far from trivial problem.[2]

Just as for groups, one can speak of *generators* for a *groupoid*. We will assume that one can find, from generators S_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,m)$ of a groupoid $\mathfrak{G}$ with identities E_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,n)$, a system of generators T_i of the group $\mathfrak{G}_0$ of elements doubly associated with the identity E_0.

Let A_i $(i = 1,2\ldots,n)$ be a system of elements with left-sided identity E_0 and right-sided identities including all E_i $(i = 1,2\ldots,n)$. Further, let $A_0 = E_0$. Now if S_i has the left identity E_{l_i} and the right identity E_{r_i} then the element

$$T_i = A_{l_i} S_i A_{r_i}^{-1} \tag{1}$$

may be called the generator of $\mathfrak{G}_0$ associated with S_i. In fact, the T_i $(i = 1,2\ldots,n)$ constitute a system of generators for $\mathfrak{G}_0$. Namely, if

$$S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_a}^{\varepsilon_a} \tag{2}$$

is any element of $\mathfrak{G}_0$, then the left identity of $S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1}$ and the right identity of $S_{\alpha_a}^{\varepsilon_a}$ is the identity E_0 and, further, the right identity of $S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$ is identical with the left identity of $S_{\alpha_{i+1}}^{\varepsilon_{i+1}}$. The product

$$T_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} T_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots T_{\alpha_a}^{\varepsilon_a}$$

that results from (2) when S_i is replaced by T_i may be converted into (2) by means of equation (1) and cancellation of formally inverse factors S_i.

2.2 Free Groups

Instead of starting with a group and constructing generators and defining relations for it, we will now proceed from a class $\mathfrak{m}$ of symbols, define the power products of these symbols, take an arbitrary system $\mathfrak{r}$ of these power products, and show that there is a group $\mathfrak{F}$ that has the symbols in $\mathfrak{m}$ as generators and the products in $\mathfrak{r}$ as defining relations. For this purpose we first explain relation-free groups, or simply *free groups with n generators*. Let

$$S_1^{+1}, S_2^{+1}, \ldots, S_n^{+1}, S_1^{-1}, S_2^{-1}, \ldots, S_n^{-1}$$

[2] Cf. Sections 2.9 and 3.1 and, e.g., J. NIELSEN, Kgl. Dan. Vid. Selsk., Math. fys. Med. **V**, 12 (1924).

be letters, which we combine into "words"

$$W = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m} \quad (\alpha_i = 1,2,\ldots,n;\ \varepsilon_i = \pm 1). \tag{1}$$

Let W_0 be the "empty" word, which contains no letters $S_i^{\pm 1}$. The word

$$W^{-1} = S_{\alpha_m}^{-\varepsilon_m} \cdots S_{\alpha_2}^{-\varepsilon_2} S_{\alpha_1}^{-\varepsilon_1}$$

is called the formal inverse of W. If

$$W_1 = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m}$$

and

$$W_2 = S_{\beta_1}^{\eta_1} S_{\beta_2}^{\eta_2} \cdots S_{\beta_{m'}}^{\eta_{m'}}$$

are two such words we set

$$W_1 W_2 = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m} S_{\beta_1}^{\eta_1} S_{\beta_2}^{\eta_2} \cdots S_{\beta_{m'}}^{\eta_{m'}}$$

and

$$W_0 W_1 = W_1 W_0 = W_1.$$

By an *elementary transformation* of a word we mean the cancellation or insertion of two symbols

$$S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} S_{\alpha_{i+1}}^{\varepsilon_{i+1}} \quad \text{when} \quad \alpha_i = \alpha_{i+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_{i+1} = 0.$$

An elementary transformation in W_1 is always one in $W_1 W_2$, but the converse does not hold. Two words W_1 and W_n [not the same as the n above] are called *equivalent*, denoted

$$W_1 \equiv W_n,$$

if there is a chain of words $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_n$ of which any successive two are convertible into each other by an elementary transformation. If $W_1 \equiv W_2$ and $W_2 \equiv W_3$ then also $W_1 \equiv W_3$, and $W_1 \equiv W_2$ implies $W_2 \equiv W_1$. We can therefore speak of the class $[W]$ of words equivalent to W, and

$$[W_1] = [W_2]$$

if and only if $W_1 \equiv W_2$.

We define a product for the classes W which, as we will show, satisfies the group axioms. We set

$$[W_1][W_2] = [W_1 W_2].$$

This product is well-defined. Namely, if $W_1' \equiv W_1$ and $W_2' \equiv W_2$ then

$$W_1' W_2' \equiv W_1 W_2$$

because elementary transformations of the W_i $(i = 1,2)$ are also elementary transformations of $W_1 W_2$. The product is associative. $[W_0]$ is the identity element and $[W^{-1}]$ is the element inverse to $[W]$.

The group so defined is called the free group with n generators. For the

$$[S_i^{+1}] \quad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$$

obviously constitute a set of generators for this group. E.g., $[W]$ in (1) is equal to

$$[S_{\alpha_1}^{+1}]^{\varepsilon_1}[S_{\alpha_2}^{+1}]^{\varepsilon_2}\cdots[S_{\alpha_m}^{+1}]^{\varepsilon_m}.$$

We can now regard the word W as a sign for the element $[W]$ and as a power product of the elements $[S_i^{+1}]$. We also write S_i for $[S_i]$ and use S_i^n in the way explained in Section 1.1.

One can define the free group with denumerably many generators in quite an analogous way.[3]

2.3 The Word Problem for Free Groups

It is easy to survey the representations of the identity element by words W, i.e., the totality of relations $\mathfrak{R}$ in the generators S_i, and to solve the word problem in general, i.e., decide directly when two words W_1 and W_2 are equivalent. For this purpose we define the concept of a reduced word and show that there is only one reduced word $|W|$ in a class $[W]$. A word W is called *reduced* if no two letters $S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}S_{\alpha_{i+1}}^{\varepsilon_{i+1}}$ with $\alpha_i = \alpha_{i+1}$ and $\varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_{i+1} = 0$ appear in W.

In order to prove our theorem, we give a unique reduction process for the word W in Section 2.1 (1). Let

$$W_1 = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1}, \quad W_2 = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1}S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad W_m = W.$$

Then $|W_1| = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1}$, $|W_2|$ is W_0 if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 = 0$, otherwise $|W_2| = W_2$. $|W_i|$ is defined inductively: if $|W_{i-1}| = W_0$, then $|W_i| = S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$; if $|W_{i-1}| \neq W_0$, S_β^ε is the last letter in $|W_{i-1}|$ and $\beta = \alpha_i$, $\varepsilon + \varepsilon_i = 0$, then $|W_i|$ is the word that results from cancelling the S_β^ε off the end of $|W_{i-1}|$; if $\beta = \alpha_i$ and $\varepsilon + \varepsilon_i = 0$ do *not* both hold then $|W_i|$ is the word $|W_{i-1}|S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$. Obviously, all words $|W_i|$ are reduced, and so $|W_m|$ is a reduced word equivalent to W.

Now let W' be the word that results from W by insertion of $S_\alpha^\varepsilon S_\alpha^{-\varepsilon}$ between $S_{\alpha_k}^{\varepsilon_k}$ and $S_{\alpha_{k+1}}^{\varepsilon_{k+1}}$. We show that our process, applied to W', leads to the same reduced word $|W'| = |W|$. We set

$$W_i' = W_i \quad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, k)$$
$$W_{k+1}' = W_k S_\alpha^\varepsilon, \quad W_{k+2}' = W_k S_\alpha^\varepsilon S_\alpha^{-\varepsilon}, \quad \ldots, \quad W_{m+2}' = W'.$$

Then

$$|W_i'| = |W_i| \quad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, k).$$

$|W_k'|$ ends either with $S_\alpha^{-\varepsilon}$, in which case $|W_{k+1}'|$ equals the word resulting from $|W_k'|$ by cancellation of $S_\alpha^{-\varepsilon}$, so that $|W_{k+2}'| = |W_k'| = |W_k|$ and in general $|W_{k+l+2}'| = |W_{k+l}|$; or else $|W_k'|$ does not end in $S_\alpha^{-\varepsilon}$, in which case

$$|W_{k+1}'| = |W_k'|S_\alpha^\varepsilon = |W_k|S_\alpha^\varepsilon,$$

[3] Another foundation for free groups is due to O. SCHREIER, Hamb. Abh. **5** (1927).

so $|W'_{k+2}| = |W_k|$ and again in general

$$|W'_{k+l+2}| = |W_{k+l}| \quad (l = 1, 2, \ldots, m-k).$$

Now if W and W^* are any words equivalent to each other they may be embedded in a chain of words of which each is convertible to its neighbor by an elementary transformation, and thus our reduction process must lead each of W, W^* to the same reduced word $|W| = |W^*|$. Since $W = |W|$ for a reduced word, *reduced words are equivalent only if they are identical.*

2.4 The Transformation Problem in Free Groups

Closely related to the word problem is the more general question of the transformation problem.[4] Given two words W_1 and W_2, one has to decide whether there is a third word W_3 such that

$$W_2 = W_3 W_1 W_3^{-1}.$$

In this case W_2 is called a "transform" of W_1; it results from W_1 by "transformation by W_3."

We first define a special class of words, the *short words.* These are reduced words

$$W = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m}$$

in which

$$\alpha_1 = \alpha_m \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_m = 0$$

do not both hold.[5]

If one permutes the letters of such a word cyclically,

$$W' = S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m} S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1},$$

then W' is also a short word. By $\{W\}$ we mean the class of short words that result from W by cyclic permutations. Since

$$W' = S_{\alpha_1}^{-\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m} S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1},$$

all elements of $\{W\}$ are transforms of W.

If W is any reduced word that is not a short word, then

$$W = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \left(S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_{m-1}}^{\varepsilon_{m-1}} \right) S_{\alpha_1}^{-\varepsilon_1},$$

so by continuing in this way we eventually obtain

$$W = W_1 \overline{W} W_1^{-1},$$

[4] Today, this is called the *conjugacy* problem, and words W_1 and W_2 such that $W_2 = W_3 W_1 W_3^{-1}$ are called *conjugate* rather than "transforms" of each other. Note that Reidemeister has spoken about conjugate subgroups already in Section 1.5. (Translator's note.)

[5] Today such words are called *cyclically reduced.* (Translator's note.)

where $\overline{W}$ is a short word. $\overline{W}$ may be called the kernel of W. By $\{\{W\}\}$ we will mean all those words that have a kernel in $\{W\}$. All words in $\{\{W\}\}$ obviously correspond to elements that are transforms of each other.

One now sees that, along with W^*, the word that results from $S_i^{\varepsilon} W^* S_i^{-\varepsilon}$ by reduction also belongs to $\{\{W\}\}$, and from this it follows that the elements belonging to $\{\{W\}\}$ are all the transforms of this element.

2.5 Groups with Arbitrary Relations

We now construct a *group with generators*

$$S_1, \quad S_2, \quad \ldots, \quad S_n$$

and defining relations

$$R_1(S), \quad R_2(S), \quad \ldots, \quad R_m(S),$$

where the R_i are any words in the S_i. We first construct the free group $\mathfrak{S}$ determined by the S_i. The R_i are extended by adjoining all LR_iL^{-1}, where L is an arbitrary element of $\mathfrak{S}$, and we construct the subgroup $\mathfrak{R}$ of $\mathfrak{S}$ consisting of all power products of the R_i and their transforms LR_iL^{-1}. This is obviously an invariant subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}$. Thus we can construct the factor group $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{S}/\mathfrak{R}$ of $\mathfrak{S}$ by $\mathfrak{R}$ by Section 1.10. We claim that the residue classes

$$S_1\mathfrak{R}, \quad S_2\mathfrak{R}, \quad \ldots, \quad S_n\mathfrak{R}$$

generate this group and that the R_i yield a system of defining relations for $\mathfrak{F}$ in the generators $S\mathfrak{R}$ when S_i is replaced by $S_i\mathfrak{R}$. The products $R_i(S\mathfrak{R})$ that result in this way are certainly relations, for it follows from

$$S_i^{\pm 1}\mathfrak{R}S_k^{\pm 1}\mathfrak{R} = S_i^{\pm 1}S_k^{\pm 1}\mathfrak{R}$$

that

$$R_i(S\mathfrak{R}) = R_i(S)\mathfrak{R} = \mathfrak{R}.$$

Conversely, if $R(S\mathfrak{R})$ is any relation in the group $\mathfrak{S}/\mathfrak{R}$ then $R(S)\mathfrak{R} = \mathfrak{R}$, so $R(S)$ must belong to $\mathfrak{R}$; i.e., $R(S)$ may be written as a power product of the $R_i(S)$ and their transforms LR_iL^{-1}. Thus the $R_i(S\mathfrak{R})$ really are a system of defining relations for $\mathfrak{S}/\mathfrak{R}$.

Since each word in the S_i corresponds to a well-defined element of the group $\mathfrak{S}/\mathfrak{R}$, we can regard it as a notation for this element and, e.g., speak of the element S_i of the group $\mathfrak{S}/\mathfrak{R} = \mathfrak{F}$ and hence call $\mathfrak{F}$ the group with generators S_i $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$ and defining relations R_k $(k = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$.[6] On the other hand, *If $\mathfrak{F}'$ is a group with the generators S_i' $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$ and defining relations $R_k'(S')$ $(k = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$, then $\mathfrak{F}'$ is isomorphic to a factor group of the free group with n free generators.*

If L and M are arbitrary power products from $\mathfrak{S}$, and R is a power product from $\mathfrak{R}$, then the element LRM is equal to LM in $\mathfrak{F}$. For LRM is in fact equal to $LM \cdot M^{-1}RM$.

[6] O. SCHREIER, Hamb. Abhdl. **5** (1927) 161.

If A is any element of $\mathfrak{F}$ then the power products of A and its transforms constitute an invariant subgroup $\mathfrak{A}$ of $\mathfrak{F}$. If we now construct $\mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{F}'$, then each power product $F(S)$ of the S_i also represents a certain element of $\mathfrak{F}'$, and in fact it represents the identity of $\mathfrak{F}'$ if and only if it represents an element A' of $\mathfrak{A}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$, i.e., if $F(S) \equiv A'R$ in $\mathfrak{S}$, where R is a consequence relation of the R_i. Thus one sees that $F(S)$ can be regarded as a consequence of the R_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,m)$ and the relation $A = R_{m+1}$.

One shows analogously: if $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_l$ are elements, which together with their transforms generate an invariant subgroup $\mathfrak{A}$ of $\mathfrak{F}$, then the relations R_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,m)$ of $\mathfrak{F}$ and the relations $R_{m+i} = A_i$ $(1 = 1,2\ldots,l)$ constitute a system of defining relations for $\mathfrak{F}' = \mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{A}$.

2.6 The general word problem

The peculiar difficulties of combinatorial problems show themselves for the first time when one tries to solve the word problem for a group with arbitrary defining relations, i.e., to decide when two products of the generators S_i denote the same element of the group $\mathfrak{F}$. We are far from a general solution of the problem and we have reached the goal in only a few cases.

That this is in the nature of things is shown by the following remark:[7]

We assume that in a group $\mathfrak{G}$ with generators S_i $(i = 1,2\ldots,n)$ there is a certain power product P_G in the generators S_i for each element G, satisfying the condition

$$P_{G_1 G_2} = P_{G_1} P_{G_2}, \tag{1}$$

i.e., the condition that both sides of (1) are identical in the free group $\mathfrak{S}$ generated by the S_i. Then the group $\mathfrak{G}$ is a free group. Namely, $\mathfrak{G}$ is isomorphic to the subgroup of the free group $\mathfrak{S}$ generated by P_G and, as we will show in Sections 3.9, 4.17, 4.20, and 7.12, the subgroups of free groups are free.

As an example[8] of a word problem we consider the *group* $\mathfrak{F}$ *with generators* S_1 *and* S_2 *and the defining relations*

$$R_1 = S_1^{a_1}, \quad R_2 = S_2^{a_2} \quad (a_1, a_2 > 1). \tag{2}$$

Here

$$S_i^{m_i} \equiv S_i^{n_i} \quad \text{when} \quad m_i \equiv n_i \pmod{a_i} \quad (i = 1,2).$$

We call a product

$$S_1^{r_{11}} S_2^{r_{21}} S_1^{r_{12}} S_2^{r_{22}} \cdots S_1^{r_{1l}} S_2^{r_{2l}} \tag{3}$$

"reduced in $\mathfrak{F}$" when $0 \le r_{ik} < a_i$ $(k = 1,2,\ldots,l; i = 1,2)$ and all r_{ik} except possibly r_{11} and r_{2l} are nonzero. The reduced product in $\mathfrak{F}$

$$S_2^{\prime r'_{2l}} S_1^{\prime r'_{1l}} \cdots S_2^{\prime r'_{21}} S_1^{\prime r'_{11}}$$

is the element inverse to (3) when $r_{ik} + r'_{ik} = a_i$. We will show that each element of our group is representable in only one way as a reduced product.

[7] W. HUREWICZ, Hamb. Abhdl. **8** (1931) 307.

[8] O. SCHREIER, Hamb. Abhdl. **3** (1924) 167.

First we give a process that associates with each reduced word W of the form (1) from Section 2.2 a unique reduced word $|W|$, "equivalent" in $\mathfrak{F}$. We set $W_1 = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1}$ and $|W_1| = S_{\alpha_1}^{r_1}$, where $\varepsilon_1 \equiv r_1 \pmod{a_{\alpha_1}}$, $0 \le r_1 < a_{\alpha_1}$, $W_2 = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2}$ and $|W_2| = S_{\alpha_1}^{r_2}$ where $\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 \equiv r_2 \pmod{a_{\alpha_1}}$, $0 \le r_2 < a_{\alpha_1}$, when $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, and $|W_2| = S_{\alpha_1}^{r_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{r_2}$ where $\varepsilon_2 \equiv r_2 \pmod{a_{\alpha_2}}$, $0 \le r_2 < a_{\alpha_2}$ when $\alpha_1 \ne \alpha_2$.

In general, let $W_i = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$ and $|W_i| = W_i' S_\beta^{r_i}$. If $\alpha_{i+1} = \beta$, let $|W_{i+1}| = W_i' S_\beta^{r'}$, where $r_i + \varepsilon_{i+1} \equiv r' \pmod{a_\beta}$, $0 \le r' < a_\beta$. If $\alpha_{i+1} \ne \beta$, let $|W_{i+1}| = |W_i| S_{\alpha_{i+1}}^{r_{i+1}}$, where $r_{i+1} \equiv \varepsilon_{i+1} \pmod{a_{\alpha_{i+1}}}$, $0 \le r_{i+1} < a_{\alpha_{i+1}}$. $|W|$ equals $|W_m|$.

Now if $W = W'W''$ and $W^* = W' S_\alpha^\varepsilon S_\alpha^{-\varepsilon} W''$ one sees that $|W'| = |W' S^\varepsilon S^{-\varepsilon}|$ and hence $|W| = |W^*|$. Further, if

$$W = W'W''$$

and

$$W^* = W' S_\alpha^\varepsilon S_\alpha^\varepsilon \cdots S_\alpha^\varepsilon W'',$$

where a_α factors S_α^ε are inserted, then likewise

$$|W'| = |W' S_\alpha^\varepsilon S_\alpha^\varepsilon \cdots S_\alpha^\varepsilon|$$

and hence also

$$|W| = |W^*|.$$

It follows that each word representing an element of the group $\mathfrak{R}$ generated by the R_i $(i = 1,2)$ and their transforms is converted into the empty word by reduction in $\mathfrak{F}$. Because each such word results from a word

$$R = L_1 R_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} L_1^{-1} L_2 R_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} L_2^{-1} \cdots L_m R_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m} L_m^{-1} \quad (\alpha_i = 1,2;\ \varepsilon_i = \pm 1)$$

by reduction in the free group on S_1, S_2. However, these R result from W_0 by successive elementary transformations and insertions of factors $(S_\alpha^\varepsilon)^{a_\alpha}$. Further, if W and W' are two words that denote the same word in $\mathfrak{F}$, then W' may be converted to the form WR by elementary transformations in $\mathfrak{S}$, where R belongs to $\mathfrak{R}$, so W and W' go to the same word by reduction in $\mathfrak{F}$.

Groups with generators

$$S_1, \quad S_2, \quad \ldots, \quad S_n$$

and defining relations

$$R_i = S_i^{a_i} \quad (i = 1,2,\ldots,n) \tag{4}$$

can be handled quite analogously. It follows easily from the solution of the word problem that if S is an element of $\mathfrak{F}$ of finite order, then

$$S = L S_i^s L^{-1}.$$

The word problem in the group $\mathfrak{F}'$ with two generators S_1 and S_2 and a single relation

$$R = S_1^{a_1} S_2^{a_2} \tag{5}$$

may be easily reduced to the case treated above.[9] Here $S_1^{a_1} = S_2^{-a_2}$, from which it follows that the element S^{a_1} commutes with all elements of $\mathfrak{F}'$, because

$$S_1 S_1^{a_1} = S_1^{a_1} S_1$$

and

$$S_2 S_1^{a_1} = S_2 S_2^{-a_2} = S_2^{-a_2} S_2 = S_1^{a_1} S_2,$$

so S^{a_1} commutes with all power products of the S_i. Each element may then be converted into a reduced word of the form

$$S_1^{r_{11}} S_2^{r_{21}} \cdots S_1^{r_{1m}} S_2^{r_{2m}} S_1^{k a_1} \quad \text{with} \quad 0 \le r_{il} < a_i.$$

One proves quite analogously as for the groups with defining relations (2) that each word is representable in only one way as a reduced word. From the solution of the word problem[10] one easily obtains that the subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}'$ generated by S^{a_1} is the center of $\mathfrak{F}'$.

2.7 The free product of groups

The methods of Section 2.2 may be extended without difficulty to the so-called free product[11] of groups. Let $\mathfrak{G}_1$ and $\mathfrak{G}_2$ be two groups with the elements G_{1i} and G_{2i} respectively. From these elements we construct words

$$W = G_1 G_2 \cdots G_n,$$

where the G_i are any elements of $\mathfrak{G}_1$ or $\mathfrak{G}_2$ different from the identity. Thus

$$G_i = G_{k_i l_i} \quad (k_i = 1 \text{ or } 2).$$

By an elementary expansion of this word W we mean the insertion of a word $G_{i1} G_{i2}$ that equals the identity when regarded as a product in $\mathfrak{G}_i$, or replacement of a letter $G_{k_i l_i}$ by two, $G'_{k_i l_i} G''_{k_i l_i}$, the product of which equals $G_{k_i l_i}$ in $\mathfrak{G}_{k_i}$. By a reduction we mean the reverse process.

Again the words W may be divided into equivalence classes $[W]$ and the product defined as in Section 2.2 by

$$[W_1][W_2] = [W_1 W_2].$$

The resulting group $\mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{G}_1 * \mathfrak{G}_2$ is called the *free product*[12] *of* $\mathfrak{G}_1$ *and* $\mathfrak{G}_2$. One can define the free product of any number of groups by iteration.

The free group with n free generators S_i is the free product of the n infinite cyclic groups generated by the S_i. The groups (4) of Section 2.6 are the free products of n

[9] M. DEHN, Math. Ann. **75** (1915) 402 and O. SCHREIER loc.cit.

[10] Further solutions of word problems are found in Section 7.14. See also W. MAGNUS, Math. Ann. **105** (1931) 52 and **106** (1932) 295; E. ARTIN, Hamb. Abhdl. **4** (1925) 47; K. REIDEMEISTER, ibid. **6** (1928) 56; M. DEHN, Math. Ann. **72** (1912) 41.

[11] O. SCHREIER, Hamb. Abhdl. **5** (1927) 16.

[12] Reidemeister uses the notation $\mathfrak{G}_1 \times \mathfrak{G}_2$, which I have dropped because of its potential for confusion with the direct product. (Translator's note.)

finite cyclic groups generated by the S_i with $S^{a_i} = 1$. This construction is important for the word problem, because one can obviously solve the problem in a free product $\mathfrak{G}$ as soon as it is solved in the original groups $\mathfrak{G}_i$. This is because the reduced word $|W|$ may be defined analogously as in Section 2.3—a word is called reduced when any two neighboring factors G_i, G_{i+1} do not belong to the same group—and it is then demonstrable that each class of reduced words contains only one in reduced form.

If

$$S_{1k} \quad (k = 1, 2 \ldots, n_1), \qquad S_{2k} \quad (k = 1, 2, \ldots, n_2)$$

are systems of generators for the groups $\mathfrak{G}_1$ *and* $\mathfrak{G}_2$, *and*

$$R_{1l}(S_{1k}) \quad (l = 1, 2, \ldots, m_1), \qquad R_{2l}(S_{2k}) \quad (k = 1, 2, \ldots, m_2)$$

are the respective sets of defining relations of $\mathfrak{G}_1$, $\mathfrak{G}_2$, *then all the* S_{ik} *and all the* R_{il} *together constitute a system of generators and defining relations for the free product* $\mathfrak{G}$. It is clear that the R_{il} are satisfied in $\mathfrak{G}$. On the other hand, one can carry out expansion and reduction of the word W, where G_i is now viewed as a power product of the S_{ik}, on the basis of the relations R_{il}, because these operations take place only between elements of the same group $\mathfrak{G}_i$. Hence the $R_{il}(S_{ik})$ are in fact the defining relations of $\mathfrak{G}$.

It follows conversely that, given a group with generators S_{1k} and S_{2k} and a system of defining relations that can be divided into two classes R_{1l} and R_{2l}, in which only the S_{il} appear in the R_{ik}, then the group in question is the free product of the subgroups generated by the S_{1k} and the S_{2k}.

The concept of the free product may be extended in the following way. The group $\mathfrak{G}_1$ may possess a subgroup $\mathfrak{U}_1$ that is isomorphic to a subgroup $\mathfrak{U}_2$ of $\mathfrak{G}_2$. Let $\boldsymbol{I}(\mathfrak{U}_1) = \mathfrak{U}_2$ be a specific isomorphism between the $\mathfrak{U}_i$. Under these assumptions we add the following process to expansion and reduction of words (1): if G_i is an element of $\mathfrak{U}_1$ or $\mathfrak{U}_2$ then G_i may be replaced by $\boldsymbol{I}(G_i)$ from $\mathfrak{U}_2$ or $\boldsymbol{I}^{-1}(G_i)$ from $\mathfrak{U}_1$.

Classification of words can again be carried out and it leads, again with the help of equation (2), to the definition of a group $\mathfrak{G}$, which may be called the *free product of* $\mathfrak{G}_1$ *and* $\mathfrak{G}_2$ *with the subgroups* $\mathfrak{U}_1$ *and* $\mathfrak{U}_2$ *amalgamated.*

A uniquely determined normal form may now be produced as follows: in the groups $\mathfrak{G}_i$ we choose a system of representatives for the residue classes modulo $\mathfrak{U}_1$, say $\mathfrak{U}_1 N_{1k}$, and modulo $\mathfrak{U}_2$, say $\mathfrak{U}_2 N_{2k}$, and then one can put each word W in the form

$$U N_1 N_2 \cdots N_n,$$

where U belongs to $\mathfrak{U}_1$, the N_l are certain representatives N_{ik}, and two neighboring N_i, N_{i+1} do not belong to the same group $\mathfrak{G}_l$.

From this one can solve the word problem in $\mathfrak{G}$ if one can give each element G_i in $\mathfrak{G}_l$ the representation $U_i N_{ik}$ $(i = 1, 2)$. If S_{1k} $(k = 1, 2, \ldots, u)$ are the generators of $\mathfrak{U}_1$, S_{1k} $(k = 1, 2, \ldots, n_1)$ the generators of $\mathfrak{G}_1$, and analogously if S_{2k} $(k = 1, 2, \ldots, u)$ are the generators of $\mathfrak{U}_2$, and S_{2k} $(k = 1, 2, \ldots, n_2)$ are those of $\mathfrak{G}_2$; and if $R_{1l}(S_{1k})$ $(l = 1, 2, \ldots, m_1)$ and $R_{2l}(S_{2k})$ $(l = 1, 2, \ldots, m_2)$ are the defining relations of $\mathfrak{G}_1$ and $\mathfrak{G}_2$ respectively; and if finally the mapping

$$\boldsymbol{I}(S_{1k}) = S_{2k} \quad (k = 1, 2, \ldots, u)$$

is an isomorphism between $\mathfrak{U}_1$ and $\mathfrak{U}_2$; then the S_{ik} $(k=1,2,\ldots,n_i;\ i=1,2)$, together with the relations $R_{il}(S)$, $(l=1,2,\ldots,n_i;\ i=1,2)$ and $S_{1k}=S_{2k}$, $(k=1,2,\ldots,u)$ are generators and relations for the free product with amalgamated subgroup, as one may prove analogously with the theorem on the free product itself.

2.8 A transformation problem

The groups treated in Section 2.6 admit an easy solution of the transformation problem. However, for what follows we will need only the special case of the relations[13]

$$R_1=S_1^3,\quad R_2=S_2^2.$$

We alter the normal form of Section 2.6 by always writing S_1^{-1} in place of S_1^2. If $\varepsilon_i=\pm1$ then each element different from the identity can be brought into one of the following reduced forms

$$W=S_1^{\varepsilon_1}S_2S_1^{\varepsilon_2}S_2\cdots S_1^{\varepsilon_m};\quad WS_2;\quad S_2W;\quad S_2WS_2;\quad S_2 \tag{1}$$

By W^{-1} we mean the power product formally inverse to W,

$$W^{-1}=S_1^{-\varepsilon_m}\cdots S_2S_1^{-\varepsilon_2}S_2S_1^{-\varepsilon_1},$$

and similarly for the other reduced products. Now for the solution of the transformation problem we remark that the first and last factors of a product (1) are either a) formally inverse to each other or b) not.

In the first case a) we can put the product in the form

$$H=LH'L^{-1}$$

where L and L^{-1} are formally inverse to each other and where the kernel H' of the product begins and ends with factors that are not formally inverse to each other. The kernel H' has the form W of (1) with $\varepsilon_1=\varepsilon_m$ when L ends with S_2, but it contains only one factor S_2 when L ends with S_1^{ε}. In the second case b) the product H has one of the forms S_2, W with $\varepsilon_1=\varepsilon_m$, WS_2, or S_2W.

We will call the products S_1^{ε}, S_2, WS_2, and S_2W short words of the first kind. The products S_1^{ε}, S_2, and W with $\varepsilon_1=\varepsilon_m$ will be called short words of the second kind. Each element has a transformed product that is a short word of the first kind; this is because it is either a short word of the first or second kind or else it has a kernel that is a short word of the second kind, and a short word of the second kind becomes a short word of the first kind by transformation with an S_1^{ε} and reduction.

We now let K denote a short word of the first kind and let $\{K\}_1$ denote the collection of products that result from K by cyclic interchange of factors. By $\{K\}_2$ we mean the collection of short words of the second kind that result from a word $WS_2=S_1^{\varepsilon_1}S_2\cdots S_2$ out of $\{K\}_1$ by the process

$$S_1^{\varepsilon_1}WS_2S^{-\varepsilon_1}=S_1^{-\varepsilon_1}S_2S_1^{\varepsilon_2}S_2\cdots S_1^{\varepsilon_m}S_2S_1^{-\varepsilon_1},$$

[13] K. REIDEMEISTER, Hamb. Abhdl. **8** (1930), 187.

as well as those short words of the first kind from $\{K\}_1$ that are also of the second kind. By $\{K\}_3$ we mean all those words H that have a kernel H' in $\{K\}_2$. Finally, let $\{K\}$ denote the totality of elements from the classes $\{K\}_i$ $(i = 1,2,3)$.

Each element obviously belongs to exactly one class $\{K\}$. Further, it is clear on the one hand that any two products in $\{K\}$ are convertible into each other by transformation and reduction, and hence they denote transforms of each other in our group, while on the other hand, if H is any word in $\{K\}$ then $S_1^{\varepsilon} H S_1^{-\varepsilon}$ and $S_2 H S_2$ yield other words in $\{K\}$ by reduction. One verifies this by considering the cases where H lies in $\{K\}_1$, $\{K\}_2$, or $\{K\}_3$. It follows in general that MHM^{-1} yields a word, by reduction, that lies in the same class $\{K\}$ as H.

Now, on the one hand, we can decide whether two reduced products belong to the same class $\{K\}$, and on the other hand each element of our group corresponds to a unique reduced product, so the transformation problem is solved.

One more remark about the powers of an element H. If H belongs to a class $\{K\}_i$, then each power H^k belongs to a class $\{\overline{K}\}_i$ with the same index i.

2.9 Generators and relations for the modular group

The modular group defined in Section 1.4 is isomorphic to the group discussed in the previous section. Thus we have solved the transformation problem for the modular group.

One can of course also solve the transformation problem by proceeding from the arithmetic representation of the substitutions and asking what conditions the coefficients

$$a, b, c, d \quad \text{and} \quad a', b', c', d'$$

must satisfy for the associated substitutions to be transformable into each other in the modular group. However, this way is much more difficult. It is connected with the question of when two binary quadratic forms

$$Ax^2 + Bxy + Cy^2 \quad \text{and} \quad A'x'^2 + B'x'y' + C'y'^2$$

are equivalent, i.e., when there there are integers

$$a, b, c, d \quad \text{with} \quad ad - bc = 1$$

such that the unprimed form goes to the primed form when x, y are replaced by

$$x = ax' + by', \quad y = cx' + dy'.$$

We now apply ourselves to the proof that *the modular group is generated by two elements S_1 and S_2 which satisfy the relations*

$$R_1 = S_1^3, \quad R_2 = S_2^2$$

and no others independent of them.

We let T be the substitution

$$x' = x + 1,$$

so that T^n is the substitution

$$x' = x + n.$$

By S we mean

$$x' = -\frac{1}{x}.$$

If A is the substitution

$$x' = \frac{ax+b}{cx+d} \quad \text{with} \quad |b| \geq |d| > 0,$$

and

$$A' = T^n A$$

corresponds to the substitution

$$x'' = \frac{a'x+b'}{c'x+d'},$$

then

$$b' = b + nd$$

and hence by suitable choice of n one can obtain

$$|b'| < |d| \leq |b|.$$

If

$$0 < |b| < |d|$$

then the substitution SA or

$$x' = \frac{cx+d}{-ax-b}$$

satisfies the previous condition. Hence it follows by induction that: for each transformation A there is a power product

$$M = S^{\varepsilon} T^{n_1} S T^{n_2} S \cdots T^{n_m} S^{\eta}$$

(ε and η equal 0 or 1) such that, in the transformation

$$x' = \frac{ax+b}{cx+d}$$

corresponding to MA, we must have $d = 0$. It must then be that $-bc = 1$, i.e.,

$$x' = -\frac{1}{x} + a,$$

and this is $T^a S$. Consequently, S and T are generators of the modular group.

Now we set $S_1 = TS$, $S_2 = S$ and confirm that $S_2^2 = 1$. Further, S_1 corresponds to the substitution

$$x' = -\frac{1}{x} + 1 = \frac{x-1}{x}.$$

S_1^2 corresponds to

$$x'' = -\frac{1}{-\frac{1}{x}+1}+1 = \frac{x}{x-1}+1 = \frac{1}{-x+1},$$

so that $S_1^3 = 1$. Since $T = S_1 S_2^{-1}$, S_1 and S_2 are also generators of the modular group. They satisfy the two given relations, and it remains only to prove that they satisfy no other relations apart from consequences of R_1 and R_2. We will show that, if one computes the substitution

$$x' = \frac{ax+b}{cx+d}$$

for a reduced word (1) from Section 2.8 in which one replaces the S_i by the corresponding modular substitutions, then it is never the identity substitution. It suffices to prove this for words of the form WS_2 since, by Section 2.8, each element of the group may be converted into a word WS_2 by transformation with S_1^{ε} or S_2.

For the proof we convert WS_2 back to a certain power product of S and T. Namely, we combine all neighboring elements S_1S_2 into powers $(S_1S_2)^{\delta_i}$ and likewise the elements $S_1^{-1}S_2$ into powers $(S_1^{-1}S_2)^{\delta_k}$ and then set

$$(S_1S_2)^{\delta_i} = T^{\delta_i}, \quad (S_1^{-1}S_2)^{\delta_k} = ST^{-\delta_k}S, \quad (\delta_i, \delta_k > 0).$$

One sees that this gives a product in S and T in which the exponents have alternating signs. But it is easy to see that such an element is never the identity substitution by computing the coefficients of the corresponding modular substitution.[14]

Another method of detemining generators and defining relations for the modular group consists in the construction of its fundamental domain in the complex number plane.[15]

2.10 A theorem of TIETZE

It is clear that a group may be defined in various ways by generators and relations. If

$$S_1, \quad S_2, \quad \ldots, \quad S_m$$

is a system of generators for a group $\mathfrak{F}$ and the set $\mathfrak{r}$ of products

$$R_1(S), \quad R_2(S), \quad \ldots, \quad R_r(S)$$

in the S_i is a system of defining relations, and if $R_{r+1}(S)$ is any consequence of these relations, then, e.g., the set that results from $\mathfrak{r}$ by addition of R_{r+1} is also a system of defining relations. If, on the other hand, $R_r(S)$ is a consequence of $R_1(S), R_2(S)\ldots$, $R_{r-1}(S)$ then the latter set is also a system of defining relations for $\mathfrak{F}$.

Further, if T is a letter denoting any power product of the S_i,

$$T = T(S),$$

[14] Cf. DIRICHLET-DEDEKIND, *Vorlesungen über Zahlentheorie*, 2nd edition, 1871, §81.

[15] Cf. a textbook on function theory, e.g., that of BIEBERBACH, vol. II.

then

$$R_{r+1} = T(S)T^{-1}$$

is a relation, and

$$S_1, \quad S_2, \quad \ldots, \quad S_m, \quad T$$

is a system of generators and, as we will show,

$$R_1(S), \quad R_2(S), \quad \ldots, \quad R_r(S), \quad R_{r+1}(S,T)$$

is a system of defining relations. This is because each relation containing only the S is a consequence of the R_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,r)$ and, using the relation R_{r+1}, each power product containing a factor T may be converted into one in the S alone. Namely, if

$$F = A(S)TB(S,T)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} F &= A(S)TT^{-1}(S)T(S)B(S,T) \\ &= A(S)R_{r+1}^{-1}T(S)B(S,T) \\ &= A(S)T(S)B(S,T) \end{aligned}$$

and the latter product contains one T factor fewer than F does. In this way the factors T^{ε} $(\varepsilon = \pm 1)$ may be removed successively.

On the other hand, if S_m is representable as a power product of $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_{m-1}$ then $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_{m-1}$ obviously constitute a system of generators. One can successively eliminate S_m from all power products. Further, if the defining relations R_1, R_2, $\ldots, R_{r-1}$ contain only the generators $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_{m-1}$ and if

$$R_r = S_m(S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_{m-1})S_m^{-1}$$

then the R_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,r-1)$ constitute a system of defining relations in the generators

$$S_1, \quad S_2, \quad \ldots, \quad S_{m-1}.$$

This is because the group defined by the

$$S_i \, (i = 1,2,\ldots,m-1), \quad R_k \, (k = 1,2,\ldots,r-1)$$

is, as we saw above, identical with that defined by

$$S_i \, (i = 1,2,\ldots,m), \quad R_k \, (k = 1,2,\ldots,r).$$

We now have an important theorem (of TIETZE[16]) that *any two systems of generators and defining relations for the same group are always convertible to each other by successive applications of the transformations above.*

[16] H. TIETZE, Mon. f. Math. u. Phys. **19**, p. 1.

Let

$$S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_m; \quad R_1(S), R_2(S), \ldots, R_r(S) \tag{1}$$

$$S'_1, S'_2, \ldots, S'_{m'}; \quad R'_1(S'), R'_2(S'), \ldots, R'_{r'}(S') \tag{2}$$

be two systems of generators and defining relations for the same group $\mathfrak{F}$. The S'_k must then be expressible in terms of the S_i and, conversely, the S_i in terms of the S'_k. If

$$S'_k = S'_k(S); \quad S_i = S_i(S')$$

then we set

$$U_k(S,S') = S'_k(S)S'^{-1}_k; \quad V_i(S,S') = S_i(S')S_i^{-1}.$$

Obviously the S_i, S'_k are a system of generators and the relations

$$R_l(S), \quad U_k(S,S') \tag{3}$$

on the one hand, as well as the relations

$$R'_l(S'), \quad V_i(S,S') \tag{4}$$

on the other, are systems of defining relations for $\mathfrak{F}$ that result from (1) and (2) respectively by successive addition of the respective generators S'_k and S_i with the respective relations U_k and V_i.

But now the relations (4) must be consequences of (3), because the relations are indeed relations in the S_i, S'_k. Similarly, the relations (3) are consequences of (4). Hence by addition of consequence relations we can extend both systems, (3) and (4), to the same system

$$S_i, S'_k; \quad R_l(S'), R'_l(S), U_k(S,S'), V_i(S,S'), \tag{5}$$

and hence convert the system (1) to the system (2) by a sequence of the transformations described.

One can apply this theorem to a purely *combinatorial characterization of the properties of a group* given by generators S_i and defining relations R_k. Each property of a system of generators S_i and relations R_k that is invariant under the above transformations of the S_i and the R_k is a property of the group $\mathfrak{F}$ defined by S_i, R_k. This is because such a property holds for all presentations of the group by generators and relations and hence it is a property of the group itself. Despite this simple connection between different presentations of the same group it is in general not possible to decide whether two groups presented by generators and relations are isomorphic to each other.[17] One also cannot decide whether such a group is a free

[17] This remarkable claim was first made by Tietze (1908) in the paper cited above. At the time when Reidemeister wrote, a precise concept of algorithm—formalizing what it means to "decide"—was still a few years away from being published. It first appeared in publications of Church, Post, and most convincingly by Turing in 1936. Another two decades elapsed before Adyan and Rabin proved that the isomorphism problem is algorithmically unsolvable, in 1958. Their work also established the unsolvability of the problems next mentioned by Reidemeister: deciding whether a given finitely-presented group is free, or trivial. It may be worth mentioning that Reidemeister could have had some intimation of the coming wave of unsolvability results, because he organized the conference in Königsberg in 1930 at which Gödel first announced his famous (and related) result on the incompleteness of formal systems. (Translator's note.)

group on "non-free" generators, or whether it follows from the relations $R_k(S)$ that all the S_i equal the identity E.

We make a simple application of the transformation rules to the modular group presentation by the generators S_1, S_2 and relations

$$R_1 = S_1^3 \equiv 1; \quad R_2 = S_2^2 \equiv 1.$$

As we have seen, the operations S and T defined in Section 2.9 also generate the modular group. We now ask what are the defining relations in the group generated by $T = S_1 S_2^2$ and $S = S_2$. For this purpose we take T as a generator in addition to S_1 and S_2 and add

$$R_3 = S_1 S_2^{-1} T^{-1}$$

as a third relation.

With the help of this equation we now eliminate S_1 from R, by first constructing $R_1' = R_3^{-1} R_1 = T S_2 S_1^2$ and then deriving R_1 as a consequence of R_1' and R_3. Then we replace R_1' by $R_1'' = S_1 T S_2 S_1$, and this in turn by

$$R_1''' = R_3^{-1} R_1'' S_1^{-1} R_3^{-1} S_1 = (T S_2)^2.$$

In this way we obtain the defining relations of the modular group in the generators $S_2 = S$ and T as

$$R_1 = (TS)^3 \equiv 1 \quad \text{and} \quad R_2 = S^2 \equiv 1.$$

2.11 Commutative groups

We will use the theorem of TIETZE to characterize the commutative or "abelian" group $\mathfrak{F}$ with finitely many generators and relations through properties of these relations. In a commutative group with generators S_i $(i = 1, 2 \ldots, n)$ each of the relations

$$R_{ik}(S) = S_i S_k S_i^{-1} S_k^{-1} \tag{1}$$

holds, since this says that S_i and S_k commute with each other. It follows that all power products of the S_i commute with each other. Hence each relation $R(S)$ may be brought into the form

$$R(S) = S_1^{r_1} S_2^{r_2} \cdots S_n^{r_n}.$$

Thus we can take the system of defining relations to be in the form

$$R_i(S) = S_1^{r_{i1}} S_2^{r_{i2}} \cdots S_n^{r_{in}} \quad (i = 1, 2, \ldots m). \tag{2}$$

The characteristic properties of a particular commutative group must then reside in the relations (2), because the relations (1) are satisfied in any commutative group. We now construct the matrix

$$\rho = (r_{ik}) \quad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, m;\ k = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$$

and show that $\mathfrak{F}$ has certain characteristic numbers that may be derived from ρ, the so-called elementary divisors of ρ.

By $\delta_i^{(k)}$ $(i = 1,2,\ldots,k \leq m,n)$ we mean the collection of k-rowed subdeterminants obtainable from ρ by striking out $m-k$ rows and $n-k$ columns. If all $\delta_i^{(s+1)} = 0$ while there is a $\delta_i^{(s)} \neq 0$ then s is called the rank of ρ. By $\delta^{(k)} > 0$ we mean the greatest common divisor of all the $\delta_i^{(k)}$ for $k \leq s$. Then $\delta^{(k)}$ is always divisible by $\delta^{(k-1)}$, because all the k-rowed determinants are linear combinations of $(k-1)$-rowed determinants. We now set

$$d_1 = \delta^{(1)}; \quad \delta^{(k)} = d_k \delta^{(k-1)} \quad (k = 2,3,\ldots,s)$$

and call d_k the kth elementary divisor of ρ. We claim

Theorem 1. *The $d_k \neq 1$ and $n-s$ are the same for all relation systems for $\mathfrak{F}$.*

Theorem 2. *New generators*

$$T_1, \quad T_2, \quad \ldots, \quad T_n$$

may be introduced, for which the defining relations take the form

$$R_i(T) = T_i^{d_i} \quad (i = 1,2,\ldots,s).$$

By leaving out the generators T_j for which $d_j = 1$ one obtains a unique normal form for $\mathfrak{F}$; the number of relation-free generators is $n-s$. On the basis of Theorems 1 and 2 we then have: *$\mathfrak{F}$ is characterized by the elementary divisors of the matrix ρ different from* 1 *and the difference $n-s$ between the number of generators and the rank of ρ.*

2.12 A theorem on matrices

To prove the theorems of the last section we first define an equivalence of matrices with respect to the following transformations. The matrix $\rho = (r_{ik})$ is called equivalent to the matrix $\rho' = (r'_{ik})$

1. if ρ' results from ρ by an exchange of rows or columns,
2. if ρ' results from ρ when the elements r_{1i} of the first row are replaced by $r'_{1i} = r_{1i} + a r_{2i}$, or when the elements r_{i1} of the first column are replaced by$r'_{i1} = r_{i1} + a r_{i2}$ (a an arbitrary integer), while all the remaining rows or columns remain unaltered,
3. if all elements in some row or column have their signs reversed,
4. if there is a chain of matrices $\rho_1 = \rho, \rho_2, \rho_3, \ldots, \rho_n = \rho'$ in which ρ_{i+1} results from ρ_i by one of the elementary transformations 1, 2, or 3. [Again, this n does not denote the number of generators.] E.g. it is a permissible transformation to add k times a row, or column, to any other row or column, respectively.

Theorem 1. *Equivalent matrices have the same rank and the same elementary divisors.*

This is clear for matrices convertible into each other by the transformation 1. If ρ' results from ρ by a row transformation 2, then any of its determinants $\delta_i'^{(k)}$ results from $\delta_i^{(k)}$ when r_{ik} is replaced by r'_{ik}, hence it equals $\delta_i^{(k)}$ if the first row does not contribute any elements to $\delta_i^{(k)}$. Otherwise, we expand $\delta_i'^{(k)}$ along the first row and obtain

$$\delta_i'^{(k)} = \delta_i^{(k)} \quad \text{or} \quad \delta_i'^{(k)} = \delta_i^{(k)} + a\,\delta_j^{(k)}$$

according as the second row appears in $\delta_i'^{(k)}$ or not. It follows that the rank s' of ρ' satisfies $s' \le s$ and that the elements $\delta'^{(k)}$ of ρ' are divisible by $\delta^{(k)}$. But since ρ also results from ρ' by a row transformation 2, because $r_{1i} = r'_{1i} - a\,r'_{2i}$, it follows that $s = s'$ and $\delta^{(k)} = \delta'^{(k)}$. Hence we have Theorem 1 for arbitrary equivalent matrices.

To clarify the meaning of the d_k we now assert:

Theorem 2. *The matrix ρ is equivalent to the matrix $\delta = (d_{ik})$, where $d_{ik} = 0$ if $i \ne k$, $d_{ii} = d_i$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, s)$ and $d_{ii} = 0$ for $i > s$.*

We first prove the following Lemma 1: *if $|r_{ik}| > d_1$ for all nonzero r_{ik}, then there is a matrix equivalent to ρ that contains a nonzero $r'_{i_1k_1}$ smaller than all $|r_{ik}|$.*

Namely, let $r_{i_1k_1}$ be a term of ρ of smallest absolute value:

$$|r_{ik}| \ge |r_{i_1k_1}|.$$

Now suppose there is either an element $r_{i_1k_2}$ of the i_1th row, or an element $r_{i_2k_1}$ of the k_1th column, which is nonzero and not divisible by $r_{i_1k_1}$. Then by subtraction of a suitable multiple, either of the k_1th column from the k_2th column, or of the i_1th row from the i_2th row, we obtain a matrix with the property claimed.

If, on the other hand, all the r_{i_1k} and r_{ik_1} are divisible by $r_{i_1k_1}$, then one can construct, by elementary transformations, an equivalent matrix ρ' in which all elements $r'_{i_1k} = r'_{ik_1} = 0$, except for $r'_{i_1k_1} = r_{i_1k_1}$. Then if there is an r'_{ik} with

$$|r'_{ik}| < |r_{i_1k_1}|$$

there is nothing more to prove. If all

$$|r'_{ik}| \ge |r_{i_1k_1}|$$

then certainly not all r'_{ik} are divisible by $r_{i_1k_1}$, otherwise

$$d_1 = d'_1 < |r_{i_1k_1}|.$$

If $r'_{i_2k_2}$ is not divisible by $r_{i_1k_1}$ then I construct ρ'' by adding the k_2th column to the k_1th column, whence

$$r''_{ik_1} = r'_{ik_2}\ (i \ne i_1); \quad r''_{i_1k_1} = r_{i_1k_1},$$

and the second case is reduced to the first.

From this we get Lemma 2: *For each matrix ρ there is an equivalent $\rho' = (r'_{ik})$ with*

$$r'_{11} = d_1; \quad r'_{1i} = r'_{i1} = 0\ (i \ne 1).$$

Firstly, by Lemma 1 there is an equivalent matrix containing an element equal to $\pm d_1$. I can bring this element into the first row and first column, and then make all

other elements of the first row and column zero by subtraction of suitable multiples of the first row and column. This is the desired matrix ρ'.

By ρ^* we mean the matrix that results from ρ' by striking out the first row and first column. The rank of ρ^* equals $s-1$, essentially because any l-rowed nonzero determinant from ρ^* can be used to construct an $(l+1)$-rowed determinant of ρ' that is likewise nonzero.

Now Theorem 2 comes about as follows:

Let $d_2^* = F_{22}$ be the greatest common divisor of the nonzero r_{ik}^*. Then d_1 is a divisor of d_2^*, since d_1 is a divisor of all r_{ik}^*, and by Lemma 2 there is a matrix $\rho^{*\prime} = (r_{ik}^{*\prime})$ equivalent to ρ^* with

$$r_{11}^{*\prime} = d_2^*; \quad r_{1i}^{*\prime} = r_{k1}^{*\prime} = 0 \quad (i,k \neq 1)$$

But then ρ itself is equivalent to the matrix $\rho'' = (r_{ik}'')$ with

$$\begin{aligned} &r_{11}'' = d_1; \quad r_{22}'' = d_{22}^* \\ &r_{1i}'' = r_{k1}'' = 0 \quad (i,k \neq 1); \quad r_{2i}'' = r_{k2}'' = 0 \quad (i,k \neq 2) \\ &r_{i+2,k+2}'' = r_{ik}^* \quad (i,k > 1). \end{aligned}$$

By iteration of this process we find that ρ is equivalent to a matrix $\overline{\rho} = (F_{ik})$ with

$$F_{ik} = 0 \quad (i \neq k); \quad \overline{r}_{ii} > 0 \quad (i = 1,2,\ldots,s), \quad \overline{r}_{ii} = 0 \quad (i > s)$$

and $\overline{r}_{ii}$ is a divisor of $F_{i+1,i+1}$.

But the $\overline{r}_{ii}$ are the elementary divisors of $\overline{\rho}$ and hence also of ρ, because all k-rowed subdeterminants from $\overline{\rho}$ that are nonzero have a value

$$\overline{r}_{i_1,i_1}\overline{r}_{i_2,i_2}\cdots\overline{r}_{i_k,i_k}$$

where all the i_l $(l = 1,2,\ldots,k)$ are different. Such a product is divisible by $\overline{r}_{11}\overline{r}_{22}\cdots\overline{r}_{kk}$, so

$$\overline{\delta}^{(k)} = \overline{r}_{11}\overline{r}_{22}\cdots\overline{r}_{kk}$$

and hence

$$\overline{r}_{kk} = \overline{d}_k = d_k.$$

One more remark: if $d_i \neq 1$ then also $d_{i+1} \neq 1$, because d_i is a divisor of d_{i+1}.

2.13 Characterization of commutative groups

We now return to the commutative group $\mathfrak{F}$ and see how the matrix $\rho = (r_{ik})$ of the exponents r_{ik} in the defining relations (2) of Section 2.11 are altered when we transform the generators and defining relations as in Section 2.10.

If R is a consequence relation of the R_i then, by means of the relations (1) of Section 2.11 for exchange of factors, R may be written on the one hand as a power product $R_1^{p_1}R_2^{p_2}\cdots R_m^{p_m}$ and on the other hand it may be brought into the form

$$S_1^{r_1}S_2^{r_2}\cdots S_n^{r_n}.$$

We therefore must have

$$r_i = \sum_{k=1}^{m} p_k r_{ki}.$$

Thus if we extend the defining relations R_i by addition of $R_{m+1} = R$ and construct the matrix of coefficients $\rho' = (r'_{ik})$ for the new system, then

$$r'_{ik} = r_{ik}; \quad r_{m+1,k} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i r_{ik}; \quad (i = 1,2,\ldots,m;\ k = 1,2,\ldots,n).$$

One can now replace ρ' by an equivalent matrix ρ'' that contains only zeros in the $(m+1)$th row by successively subtracting p_i times the ith row from the last row. Since ρ results from ρ' by omitting the last row, the elementary divisors and rank of ρ and ρ'', and hence also of ρ and ρ', are identical.

Now let T be any power product

$$T = S_1^{q_1} S_2^{q_2} \cdots S_n^{q_n}.$$

Take T as a new generator and

$$S_1^{q_1} S_2^{q_2} \cdots S_n^{q_n} T^{-1}$$

as a new relation. The new coefficient matrix is then $\rho' = (r'_{ik})$, where $r'_{ik} = r_{ik}$ $(i = 1,2,\ldots,m;\ k = 1,2,\ldots,n)$; $r_{i,n+1} = 0$ $(i \neq m+1)$; $r_{m+1,k} = q_k$ $(k \neq n+1)$; and $r_{m+1,n+1} = -1$. We can convert ρ' into a matrix ρ'' by successively adding q_k times the last column to the kth column. In ρ'' all elements of the $(m+1)$th row and the $(n+1)$th column apart from $r''_{m+1,n+1} = -1$ are zero. Now d''_1 is certainly equal to 1, because $r''_{m+1,n+1} = -1$. Further, $d''_i = d_{i-1}$, because all i-rowed nonzero determinants from ρ'' are either determinants from ρ or else they contain the element $r''_{m+1,n+1}$ and hence are equal to an $(i-1)$-rowed determinant from ρ. Conversely, from each $(i-1)$-rowed determinant of ρ we can construct an i-rowed determinant of ρ'' with the same absolute value by taking suitable elements from the $(m+1)$th row and the $(n+1)$th column. Since all $\delta_i^{(k)}$ are divisible by $\delta^{(k-1)}$ we have

$$\delta''^{(k)} = \delta^{(k-1)}.$$

Therefore the elementary divisors d'_i of ρ' are equal to d_{i-1} for $i > 1$, and $d'_1 = 1$. From the connection between the determinants of ρ and ρ'' it also follows that the rank s'' of ρ'' is equal to $s+1$. Consequently, the rank s' of ρ' is also $s+1$. Theorem 1 of Section 2.11 then follows.

To prove Theorem 2 in Section 2.11 we show that *the transformations defined in Section* 2.12 *may be accomplished for the matrix* ρ *of exponents* r_{ik} *by alteration of the generators and defining relations.* Transformation 1 may be accomplished by changing the numbering of generators and relations, and transformation 3 by changing to the inverse of a generator or relation. We accomplish transformation 2 by first taking the consequence relation $R_1 R_2^k$,

$$S_1^{r_{11}+kr_{21}} S_1^{r_{12}+kr_{22}} \cdots S_1^{r_{1n}+kr_{2n}} = R'_1.$$

But then $R_1 = R_1' R_2^{-k}$ is a consequence relation of $R_1', R_2, \ldots, R_m$ and hence may be omitted. We accomplish the column transformation 2 by taking the new generator S_2' and relation $R_{m+1} = S_2'^{-1} S_1^{-k} S_2$. Then $S_2 = S_1^k S_2'$ and if we now replace S_2 in all relations by $S_1^k S_2'$, using R_{m+1}, then

$$R_i' = S_1^{r_{i1}+kr_{i2}} S_2'^{r_{i2}} \cdots S_n^{r_{in}}.$$

The R_i' are consequence relations of the R_i $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, m+1)$. But conversely, the R_i are also consequence relations of the R_i' $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$ and R_{m+1}, since indeed $R_i = R_i' R_{m+1}^{-r_{i2}}$. Consequently, the R_i' and R_{m+1} form a system of defining relations, and hence so do the R_i' alone, when S_2 and R_{m+1} are both omitted. Theorem 2 in Section 2.11 now follows from Theorem 2 in Section 2.12.

The *word problem* may be simply solved for a commutative group in the normal form given by Theorem 2 of Section 2.11. All representations of the identity are comprised by

$$R_1^{k_1} R_2^{k_2} \cdots R_s^{k_s} = T_1^{k_1 d_1} T_2^{k_2 d_2} \cdots T_s^{k_s d_s}.$$

The d_i are zero for $i > s$. If

$$T_1^{n_1} T_2^{n_2} \cdots T_n^{n_n} \quad \text{and} \quad T_1^{n_1'} T_2^{n_2'} \cdots T_n^{n_n'}$$

are two words in the T, then they are the same element if and only if

$$n_i \equiv n_i' \pmod{d_i}.$$

If all $d_i = 0$ the group is called a *free commutative* or a *free* ABELIAN *group.* Free ABELIAN groups are characterised by the number of their generators.

2.14 Commutative groups with operators

Using the coefficients defined in Section 1.13 for a commutative group with operator x, the concepts of "generator," "relation," and "defining relation" may be extended as follows.[18] *The elements*

$$S_1, \quad S_2, \quad \ldots, \quad S_n \tag{1}$$

are called the generators of the commutative group $\mathfrak{F}_x$ with operator when each element of $\mathfrak{F}$ may be written as a power product

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} S_i^{f_i(x)}. \tag{2}$$

Such a product is called a relation when it is equal to the identity element of the group. *The relations*

$$R_1, \quad R_2, \quad \ldots, \quad R_m$$

[18] J. W. ALEXANDER, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **30** (1928), 275.

are called defining relations of $\mathfrak{F}_x$ in the generators S if each relation $R(S)$ may be derived, by rearrangement of terms, from a product

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} R_i^{g_i(x)}. \tag{3}$$

Conversely, *given any system of generators*

$$S_1, \quad S_2, \quad \ldots, \quad S_n$$

and a system of relations

$$R_i(S) = S_1^{r_{i1}(x)} S_2^{r_{i2}(x)} \cdots S_n^{r_{in}(x)} \qquad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$$

there is always a commutative group with operator defined by this system. To prove this we introduce new symbols

$$S_i^{x^k} = S_{i,k} \qquad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n;\ k = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots)$$

and set

$$S_i^{a_n x^n + a_{n+1} x^{n+1} + \cdots + a_{n+m} x^{n+m}} = S_{i,n}^{a_n} S_{i,n+1}^{a_{n+1}} \cdots S_{i,n+m}^{a_{n+m}}.$$

The relations $R_l(S_i)$ may be transcribed as relations $R_i(S_{i,k})$ in the $S_{i,k}$. We include all relations $(R_l)^{x^p} = R_{l,p}(S_{i,k})$ $(p = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots)$ expressed in the $S_{i,k}$. Then there is a commutative group $\mathfrak{F}$ generated by the $S_{i,k}$ and defined by the relations

$$R_l^{x^p} = R_{l,p}(S_{i,k}).$$

In this group the mapping defined on power products F of the $S_{i,k}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{A}(S_{i,k}) &= S_{i,k+1} \\ \boldsymbol{A}(F_1 F_2) &= \boldsymbol{A}(F_1)\boldsymbol{A}(F_2) \end{aligned}$$

is an automorphism, because it sends each power product $R_{l,k}$ to the power product $R_{l,k+1}$ and hence each relation goes to another relation. Thus if F_1 and F_2 are two different power products in the $S_{i,k}$ which denote the same element of $\mathfrak{F}$, so

$$F_1 = F_2 R$$

(i.e., F_1 is convertible to $F_2 R$ by rearranging and applying the relation $S_{i,k}^a S_{i,k}^b = S_{i,k}^{a+b}$), then

$$\boldsymbol{A}(F_1) = \boldsymbol{A}(F_2)\boldsymbol{A}(R),$$

and hence also

$$\boldsymbol{A}(F_1) \equiv \boldsymbol{A}(F_2).$$

Likewise, one concludes from

$$F_1 F_2 \equiv F_{12}$$

that

$$\boldsymbol{A}(F_1)\boldsymbol{A}(F_2) \equiv \boldsymbol{A}(F_{12}).$$

Furthermore, the mapping $\boldsymbol{A}$ is invertible, and hence it is an automorphism of $\mathfrak{F}$.

If we now introduce the exponent x into the group by setting

$$\boldsymbol{A}(F) = F^x$$

then one sees that

$$S_{i,k} = S_{i,0}^{x^k} = S_i^{x^k}$$

and that we have a system of generators S_i and a system of defining relations $R_l(S_k)$ for the group when the exponents $f(x)$ are admitted.

2.15 Characterization of groups with operators

As for ordinary groups, one can ask how the various ways of defining a group with operators by generators and relations are connected to each other. It is clear that one can add any consequence to the defining relations, or omit any relation R_m when it is a consequence of the others. Likewise, it is permissible to introduce a new generator S_{n+1} defined as a power product of the $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_n$ with the help of a new relation, or to eliminate a generator S_n that may be expressed in terms of the others. One can then prove, by considerations quite similar to those in Section 2.10, that any two systems of generators and defining relations may be converted to each other by such steps.

As a result, the properties of the defining relations characteristic of the group $\mathfrak{F}$ with operator x can be given purely formally as matrix properties. If

$$R_i(S_k) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} S_k^{r_{ik}(x)}$$

are the defining relations of $\mathfrak{F}_x$ and

$$\rho = (r_{ik}(x))$$

is the matrix of exponents $r_{ik}(x)$, and if

$$R_{m+1} = \prod_{k=1}^{m} R_k^{p_k(x)} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} S_i^{r_{m+1,i}(x)}$$

is a consequence relation, then

$$r_{m+1,i} = \sum_{k=1}^{m} p_k r_{ki}.$$

If we add R_{m+1} to the others as a defining relation, then the exponent matrix of the new system will be denoted by $\rho' = (r'_{ik})$. The passage from ρ to ρ', as well as from ρ' to ρ, will be called a type I rearrangement of matrices. If

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} S_i^{r_{m+1,i}}$$

is any power product, S_{n+1} is a new generator and $r_{m+1,n+1}=-1$, and if we add S_{n+1} as a new generator and

$$R_{m+1}=\prod_{i=1}^{n+1}S_i^{r_{m+1,i}}$$

as a new relation, then the matrix corresponding to the new system will be denoted by ρ''. The passage from ρ to ρ'' and conversely will be called a type II matrix rearrangement.

The properties of exponent matrices invariant under rearrangements of the first and second kind characterize the group $\mathfrak{F}$.

It now remains to show that the elementary divisors of ρ may also be defined in this case, that the elementary divisors $\neq x^n$ are the same for all presentations of $\mathfrak{F}_x$, but that they do *not* chacterize $\mathfrak{F}_x$.

For this purpose we introduce the *concept of divisibility and greatest common divisor for L-polynomials with integral coefficients*. We call $f(x)$ divisible by $g(x)$ when there is a polynomial $h(x)$ for which

$$f(x)=g(x)h(x).$$

By the greatest common divisor $d(x)$ of the polynomials $f_i(x)\,(i=1,2,\ldots,r)$,

$$d(x)=(f_1(x),f_2(x),\ldots,f_r(x))$$

we mean a polynomial which is a divisor of all the $f_i(x)$ and divisible by all their common divisors. We show that greatest common divisors always exist, and if $d_1(x)$ and $d_2(x)$ are both greatest common divisors of the $f_i(x)$ then

$$d_2(x)=\pm x^n d_1(x).$$

Further: if $d(x)$ is a greatest common divisor of the $f_i(x)\,(i=1,2,\ldots,r)$, and if

$$f_{r+1}(x)=\sum n_i(x)f_i(x)$$

is a linear combination of the $f_i(x)$, then $d(x)$ is likewise the greatest common divisor of

$$f_i(x)\qquad(i=1,2,\ldots,r+1).$$

Elementary divisors of a matrix $\rho(x)$ may now be defined exactly as the elementary divisors of the matrix ρ were in Section 2.11. Moreover, equivalence of matrices $\rho(x)$ may be defined as in Section 2.12, except that integers are replaced by arbitrary L-polynomials in the definition of the transformation 2. It then follows that *equivalent matrices have the same elementary divisors*, and it follows in turn, by considerations like those in Sections 2.12 and 2.13, that the elementary divisors $\neq x^n$ of an exponent matrix are invariant under the matrix rearrangements of types I and II. The proofs of these theorems for integral matrices may be carried over directly, since they use only properties of the greatest common divisor $d(x)$.

An example later will illustrate that matrices with the same elementary divisors need not be equivalent, and that groups $\mathfrak{F}_x$ are therefore not characterized by the elementary divisors of the exponent matrix of their defining relations.

2.16 Divisibility properties of L-polynomials

We will reduce the divisibility relations between L-polynomials with integral coefficients to those between ordinary polynomials with integral coefficients. *We call the integral domain of integral L-polynomials $\mathfrak{I}$, and that of the integral ordinary polynomials, $\mathfrak{I}_g$.* The ordinary polynomial $f(x)$ is said to be divisible by the ordinary polynomial $g(x)$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$ if there is an ordinary polynomial $h(x)$ such that

$$f(x)=g(x)h(x).$$

If

$$f(x)=a_n x^n+a_{n+1}x^{n+1}+\cdots+a_{n+m}x^{n+m},\quad a_n\neq 0,$$

then by $|f(x)|$ we mean the ordinary polynomial $x^{-n}f(x)$. We now claim: *if $f(x)$ is divisible by $g(x)$, then $|f(x)|$ is divisible by $|g(x)|$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$, and conversely, if $|f(x)|$ is divisible by $|g(x)|$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$ then $f(x)$ is divisible by $g(x)$.*

Namely, if

$$f(x)=g(x)h(x)$$

and

$$|f(x)|=x^{-n}f(x),\quad |g(x)|=x^{-m}g(x)$$

then

$$|f(x)|=|g(x)|x^{m-n}h(x).$$

The polynomial $x^{m-n}h(x)$ must now be equal to

$$c_0+c_1x+\cdots+c_lx^l$$

with $c_0\neq 0$, and thus

$$|x^{m-n}h(x)|=x^{m-n}h(x).$$

So $|f(x)|$ is divisible by $|g(x)|$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$. The converse is trivial.

To find the divisors of $f(x)$ we therefore need only to find the divisors $t(x)$ of $|f(x)|$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$; $x^n t(x)$ then yields all the divisors of $f(x)$ when n runs through all the integers and $t(x)$ runs through all the divisors of $|f(x)|$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$.

Now to find the divisors of a polynomial in $\mathfrak{I}_g$ we must introduce yet another domain of polynomials and a new concept of divisibility. By $\mathfrak{I}_r$ we mean the collection of ordinary polynomials in one variable with rational coefficients. We denote polynomials from $\mathfrak{I}_g$ with a subscript g, polynomials from $\mathfrak{I}_r$ with a subscript r. $\mathfrak{I}_g$ is contained in $\mathfrak{I}_r$. Addition and multiplication of polynomials in $\mathfrak{I}_r$ are defined as in Section 1.13. One verifies that $\mathfrak{I}_r$ is also an integral domain. A polynomial $f_r(x)$ is said to be divisible by $g_r(x)$ in $\mathfrak{I}_r$ if there is a polynomial $h_r(x)$ such that

$$f_r(x)=g_r(x)h_r(x).$$

In order to describe the relation between divisibility in $\mathfrak{I}_g$ and $\mathfrak{I}_r$ we call a polynomial

$$f_g(x)=a_0+a_1x+\cdots+a_nx^n$$

from $\mathfrak{I}_g$ *primitive* when the greatest common divisor

$$(a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n) = a$$

is equal to 1. If

$$f_r(x) = b_0 + b_1 x + \cdots + b_m x^m$$

is a polynomial from $\mathfrak{I}_r$ then we take the rational numbers b_i to their least common denominator $n \geq 1$ [not the same n] as

$$b_i = \frac{b_i'}{n},$$

denote by b the greatest common divisor of the b_i', and set

$$b_i' = b b_i'' \qquad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, m).$$

The polynomial $\sum_{i=0}^{n} b_i'' x^i$ is then a primitive polynomial uniquely determined by $f_r(x)$, which we may denote by $||f_r(x)||$, and

$$f_r(x) = \frac{b}{n} ||f_r(x)||.$$

For the polynomial $f_g(x)$ we have

$$f_g(x) = a||f_g(x)||,$$

where a, as above, is the greatest common divisor of the coefficients of $f_g(x)$.

The connection between the divisors t_g of f_g in $\mathfrak{I}_g$ and the divisors t_r of f_g in $\mathfrak{I}_r$ is now the following:

If t_r is a divisor of f_g in $\mathfrak{I}_r$ and $f_g = a||f_g||$, then $t \cdot ||t_r||$ is a divisor of f_g in $\mathfrak{I}_g$ when t is a divisor of a. If, on the other hand, t_g is a divisor of f_g in $\mathfrak{I}_g$, then t_g is also a divisor of f_g in $\mathfrak{I}_r$, and if $t_g = t||t_r||$ then t is a divisor of a. Thus the $t||t_r||$ comprise all divisors of f_g in $\mathfrak{I}_g$. The proof depends as usual on the theorem[19] on primitive polynomials: the product of primitive polynomials is again a primitive polynomial.

If $t_r(x)$ is a divisor of $f_g(x)$ in $\mathfrak{I}_r$, then $t_r(x)$ is also a divisor of $||f_g(x)||$. Now let

$$||f_g(x)|| = t_r(x) \cdot h_r(x),$$
$$t_r(x) = \frac{c_1}{n_1} ||t_r(x)||, \quad h_r(x) = \frac{c_2}{n_2} ||h_r(x)||.$$

Then

$$n_1 n_2 ||f_g(x)|| = c_1 c_2 ||t_r(x)|| \cdot ||h_r(x)||.$$

Since $||t_r|| \cdot ||h_r||$ is a primitive polynomial, the greatest common divisor of the coefficients on the right hand side equals $c_1 c_2$, and that of those on the left is $n_1 n_2$, so

$$c_1 c_2 = n_1 n_2.$$

[19] This theorem is commonly known as *Gauss's lemma*, because of its appearance in Article 42 of Gauss's *Disquisitiones arithmeticae*. (Translator's note.)

Thus

$$||f_f(x)|| = ||t_r(x)|| \cdot ||h_r(x)||,$$

so $||t_r||$ is a divisor of $||f_g||$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$, and hence also a divisor of f_g in $\mathfrak{I}_g$. But then $t||t_r||$ is also a divisor of $f_g(x)$ when t is a divisor of a.

If, on other hand, $t_g(x)$ is a divisor of $f_g(x)$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$, so that

$$f_g(x) = t_g(x)h_g(x),$$

and if

$$f_g(x) = a||f_g(x)||, \quad t_g(x) = t||t_g(x)||, \quad h_g(x) = h||h_g(x)||,$$

then $a = t\,h$ and the converse follows.

2.17 Greatest common divisor

In the domains $\mathfrak{I}_g$ and $\mathfrak{I}_r$ we define the greatest common divisors of n polynomials

$$\begin{array}{rcccc} & f_{g1}(x), & f_{g2}(x), & \ldots, & f_{gn}(x), \\ \text{respectively,} & f_{r1}(x), & f_{r2}(x), & \ldots, & f_{rn}(x), \end{array}$$

in the usual way as follows: $d_g(x)$, respectively $d_r(x)$, is called the greatest common divisor of the f_{gi}, respectively f_{ri}, if $d_g(x)$, respectively $d_r(x)$, is a common divisor of all the f_{gi}, respectively f_{ri}, and each common divisor of all the f_{gi}, respectively f_{ri}, is also a divisor of $d_g(x)$, respectively $d_r(x)$.

In algebra one shows that a greatest common divisor of n polynomials in $\mathfrak{I}_r$ exists, and may be determined, and that two different greatest common divisors of the same polynomials, say $d_r(x)$ and $d'_r(x)$, differ only by a constant factor:

$$d'_r(x) = c\,d_r(x).$$

Thus $\pm||d_r(x)||$ is uniquely determined. We now claim:

If $d_r(x)$ is a greatest common divisor of the polynomials

$$f_{g1}(x), \quad f_{g2}(x), \quad \ldots, \quad f_{gn}(x)$$

in $\mathfrak{I}_r$, and a is the greatest common divisor of the coefficients of the $f_{gi}(x)$, then $a||d_r(x)||$ is the greatest common divisor of the polynomials f_{gi} in $\mathfrak{I}_g$. Namely, $a||d_r(x)||$ is a divisor of $f_{gi}(x)$, because if

$$f_{gi}(x) = a^{(i)}||f_{gi}(x)||$$

then a is a divisor of $a^{(i)}$ and $d_r(x)$ is a divisor of $f_{gi}(x)$ in $\mathfrak{I}_r$, hence $||d_r(x)||$ is a divisor of $f_{gi}(x)$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$. Conversely, if $t_g(x)$ is a divisor of all the $f_{gi}(x)$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$ and $t_g = t||t_g(x)||$ then t must divide all of the $a^{(i)}$ and hence also a. And $||t_g(x)||$ is a divisor of all the $f_{gi}(x)$ in $\mathfrak{I}_r$, so $||t_g(x)||$ is likewise a divisor of $d_r(x)$ in $\mathfrak{I}_r$, hence $||t_g(x)||$ is also a divisor of $||d_r(x)||$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$. Thus $a||d_r(x)|| = d_g(x)$ is the greatest common divisor of the polynomials $f_{gi}(x)$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$. If $d'_g(x)$ is another greatest common divisor

in $\mathfrak{I}_g$ then $d'_g(x)$ is also a greatest common divisor in $\mathfrak{I}_r$ and we must therefore have $d'_g(x) = c||d_g(x)||$. Further, c must divide all $a^{(i)}$ and likewise a must divide c, so $c = \pm a$ and hence $d_g(x) = \pm d'_g(x)$.

Finally we return to the original integral domain $\mathfrak{I}$ of the polynomials $f(x)$. If $f_i(x)$ $(i = 1,2,\ldots,m)$ are polynomials of $\mathfrak{I}$ and $d_g(x)$ is the greatest common divisor of the $|f_i(x)|$, then $d_g(x)$ is also the greatest common divisor of the $f_i(x)$. Because $d_g(x)$ is a divisor of the $|f_i(x)|$ and hence also of the $f_i(x)$, and if $t(x)$ is a common divisor of the $f_i(x)$ then $|t(x)|$ is also a common divisor of the $|f_i(x)|$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$, and thus a divisor of $d_g(x)$.

If $f(x)$ is any greatest common divisor of the $f_i(x)$ then $|d(x)|$ is a divisor of the $|f_i(x)|$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$, so $|d(x)|$ is a divisor $d_g(x)$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$, i.e., $d_g(x) = |d(x)|h_g(x)$. Conversely, $d_g(x)$ is a common divisor of the $|f_i(x)|$, hence also of the $f_i(x)$, so $d_g(x)$ is among the divisors of $d(x)$ in $\mathfrak{I}$, i.e.,

$$d(x) = d_g(x)h(x),$$

which implies

$$|d(x)| = |d_g(x)||h(x)|.$$

Since also

$$|d_g(x)| = |d(x)||h_g(x)|,$$

it follows that

$$|d(x)| = |d(x)||h_g(x)||h(x)|,$$

whence

$$|h_g(x)||h(x)| = 1$$

and so

$$|h_g(x)| = \pm 1, \quad |h(x)| = \pm 1.$$

It follows that

$$d(x) = \pm d_g(x)x^n.$$

Finally, let

$$f_{m+1}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} n_i(x)f_i(x).$$

We claim: *a greatest common divisor in $\mathfrak{I}$ of the $f_i(x)$ $(i = 1,2,\ldots,m)$ is also a greatest common divisor of $f_i(x)$ and $f_{m+1}(x)$, and conversely.* Namely, each common divisor of the $f_i(x)$ is also one of $f_i(x)$ and $f_{m+1}(x)$, and conversely.

2.18 An example

A simple example of a group $\mathfrak{F}_x$ which is not characterized by the elementary divisors of its exponent matrix is the group with the relations

$$R_1 = S^{x^2+1} \equiv 1, \quad R_2 = S^2 \equiv 1. \tag{1}$$

The greatest common divisor $d_g(x)$ of x^2+1 and 2 is obviously 1. Another matrix with the same elementary divisors is given by

$$R_1' = S \equiv 1.$$

We will show that the element S does not equal the identity in the group defined by (1). If, on the contrary, S were a consequence relation, then, by Section 2.14,

$$S = S^{(x^2+1)n_1(x)+2n_2(x)}$$

would hold for suitable $n_i(x)$. That is,

$$1 = (x^2+1)n_1(x) + 2n_2(x). \tag{2}$$

This polynomial relation must hold for all values of x, but if we set $x = 1$ we see that the right hand side is divisible by 2 and hence cannot equal 1.

If we set $S_i = S^{x^i}$ and substitute the S_i into R_1 it follows that

$$S_{i+2} = S_i^{-1}, \quad \text{so} \quad S_{i+4} = S_i.$$

If we take S_1, S_2 as generators then the relation

$$S^{x^n(x^2+1)} \equiv 1$$

may be used to express the remaining S_i in terms of S_1 and S_2. R_2 then says

$$S_1^2 \equiv 1, \quad S_2^2 \equiv 1$$

and we have

$$S_1^x = S_2^{-1} = S_2, \quad S_2^x = S_1^{-1} = S_1.$$

The unsatisfiability of equation (2) also shows a property of the greatest common divisor $d_g(x)$ of two polynomials $f_{g1}(x)$ and $f_{g2}(x)$ in $\mathfrak{I}_g$. Namely, $d_g(x)$ is not in general expressible as a linear combination of $f_{g1}(x)$ and $f_{g2}(x)$.

2.19 Factor groups with respect to commutator groups

A commutative group may be constructed from each group with generators S_1, S_2, …, S_n and relations $R_1(S), R_2(S), \ldots, R_m(S)$ by adding the relations

$$R_{ik} = S_i S_k S_i^{-1} S_k^{-1}. \tag{1}$$

The group that results from $\mathfrak{F}$ in this way is called $\mathfrak{F}'$. We claim that $\mathfrak{F}' = \mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{K}_1$, *the factor group of* $\mathfrak{F}$ *by the commutator group* $\mathfrak{K}_1$. Certainly $\mathfrak{K}_1$ contains all the R_{ik}, and hence all transforms of the R_{ik} and their power products, hence all consequence relations of the R_{ik}. However, if A and B are any power products of the S_i ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$) then it follows from (1) that A commutes with B, so

$$ABA^{-1}B^{-1}$$

is a consequence relation of the R_{ik}. Therefore, since each commutator element of $\mathfrak{F}$ may be represented as a power product of the R_{ik} and their transforms, the R_{ik} and their transforms generate the group $\mathfrak{K}_1$, so $\mathfrak{F}'$ is indeed equal to $\mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{K}_1$.

Similarly, one can also construct the factor group of $\mathfrak{F}$ by the second commutator group $\mathfrak{K}_2$, $\mathfrak{F}'' = \mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{K}_2$, by taking, in place of (1), the relations

$$R_{ikl} = S_l R_{ik} S_l^{-1} R_{ik}^{-1} \qquad (i,k,l = 1,2,\ldots,n). \tag{2}$$

This is because these relations have the consequence

$$F R_{ik} F^{-1} \equiv R_{ik}$$

for each element F of $\mathfrak{F}$, so S_l commutes with $F R_{ik} F^{-1}$ and hence with all elements of $\mathfrak{K}_1$. The equations (2) now similarly permit a simple representation of all elements by power products, as with commutative groups.

The power product $F(S)$ of the S_l is equivalent in $\mathfrak{F}''$ to a product

$$S_1^{r_1} S_2^{r_2} \cdots S_n^{r_n} K,$$

where K belongs to the commutator group $\mathfrak{K}_1$, and hence is a product of the R_{ik} and their transforms. Now if we introduce new generators T_{ik} by the relations

$$T_{ik}^{-1} R_{ik} \equiv 1 \qquad (i < k)$$

then, in consequence of the relations (2),

$$F T_{ik} F^{-1} \equiv T_{ik}$$

and

$$T_{ik} T_{lm} \equiv T_{lm} T_{ik}, \quad T_{ik} \equiv R_{ki}^{-1},$$

thus

$$K \equiv T_{12}^{r_{12}} \cdots T_{1n}^{r_{1n}} T_{23}^{r_{23}} \cdots T_{n-1,n}^{r_{n-1,n}}.$$

The products R_{ikl} go to the empty word under this conversion.

In particular, one can express the relations $R_i(S)$ in the given form, so we have

$$R_i(S) \equiv S_1^{r_{i1}} S_2^{r_{i2}} \cdots S_n^{r_{in}} T_{12}^{r_{i,12}} \cdots T_{n-1,n}^{r_{i,n-1,n}}.$$

Striking out the T_{ik}, one obtains the relations of $\mathfrak{F}' = \mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{K}_1$.

We will now deal in more detail with the case where all $r_{ik} = 0$, so that the group $\mathfrak{F}' = \mathfrak{F}/\mathfrak{K}_1$ is a free ABELIAN group with n generators. Then the

$$R_i \equiv T_{12}^{r_{i,12}} \cdots T_{n-1,n}^{r_{i,n-1,n}}$$

are also the defining relations of the subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}''$ generated by the T_{ik}, the commutator group $\mathfrak{K}_1''$ of $\mathfrak{F}''$. This is a commutative group that is completely characterized by the elementary divisors of the matrix $(r_{i,lk})$. Since $\mathfrak{K}_1''$ is also the factor group of $\mathfrak{K}_1$ by $\mathfrak{K}_2$, $\mathfrak{K}_1/\mathfrak{K}_2$, in the elementary divisors of $(r_{i,lk})$ we have numbers determined by the group $\mathfrak{F}$ itself, and not dependent on the presentation of $\mathfrak{F}$ by generators and relations.[20]

[20] Cf. K. REIDEMEISTER, Hamb. Abhdl. **5**, 33 and H. ADELSBERGER, J. f. reine u. angew. Math. **163** (1930) 103.

Chapter 3

Determination of Subgroups

3.1 Generators of Subgroups

Many deeper insights into the structure of a group are obtained by a process for determining generators and defining relations for subgroups.[1] This process allows, e.g., the commutator subgroup of a group to be constructed. A geometric interpretation of the following considerations will be found in Sections 4.20 and 6.14.

Let $\mathfrak{m}$ *be a set of generators* $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_n$ *of a group* $\mathfrak{F}$, $\mathfrak{U}$ *a subgroup of* $\mathfrak{F}$ *and* $\mathfrak{g}$ *a system of representatives*

$$G_1, G_2, , \ldots$$

of the left-sided residue classes $\mathfrak{U}G$ *of* $\mathfrak{U}$ *in* $\mathfrak{F}$. The residue class $\mathfrak{U}$ itself may be represented by the identity element $E = 1$, the remaining G_i are fixed power products of the S. If F is any element of $\mathfrak{F}$ and if F belongs to the residue class $\mathfrak{U}G$, then we define $\overline{F}$ by

$$\overline{F} = G.$$

If U belongs to $\mathfrak{U}$ then $\overline{UF} = \overline{F}$ and in particular $\overline{U} = 1$. Under these assumptions we claim that *the elements*

$$U_{G,S} = GS\overline{GS}^{-1}$$

constitute a system $\mathfrak{U}$ *of generators for the subgroup* $\mathfrak{U}$ *when* G *and* S *run through the classes* $\mathfrak{g}$ *and* $\mathfrak{m}$ *independently of each other.*

To prove this we first remark that the $U_{G,S}$ themselves belong to the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$. Namely, since GS and $\overline{GS}$ belong to the same residue class of $\mathfrak{U}$ we have

$$GS \equiv U\overline{GS},$$

where U is a suitable element of $\mathfrak{U}$. Consequently

$$U_{G,S} \equiv U\overline{GS}\,\overline{GS}^{-1} = U.$$

[1] For the following sections cf. K. REIDEMEISTER, Hamb. Abhandl. **5**, (1926), 8 and O. SCHREIER, Hamb. Abhandl. **5**, (1926), 161

If we now note that

$$GS^{-1}\overline{GS^{-1}}^{-1}$$

is formally inverse to $\overline{GS^{-1}}SG^{-1}$, and that the latter is an element $U_{G,S}$ (namely, the element $U_{G',S}$ with $G' = \overline{GS^{-1}}$, since $\overline{G'S} = \overline{\overline{GS^{-1}}S} = G$) then we can easily see that each power product of the S_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,n)$

$$S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m} \qquad (\varepsilon_k = \pm 1, k = 1,2,\ldots,m) \tag{1}$$

which yields an element of $\mathfrak{U}$ may also be written as a power product in the $U_{G,S}$. Namely, we set

$$W_0 = 1, \quad W_1 = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1}, \quad W_2 = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad W_m = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m}$$

and construct

$$\overline{W}_0 S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \overline{W}_1^{-1} \overline{W}_1 S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \overline{W}_2^{-1} \overline{W}_2 \cdots \overline{W}_{\alpha_{m-1}}^{-1} \overline{W}_{\alpha_{m-1}} S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m} \overline{W}_m^{-1}.$$

Since $\overline{W}_0 = \overline{1} = 1$ and $W_m = 1$ likewise, because W_m belongs to $\mathfrak{U}$, this power product becomes (1) by elementary computations in the free group on the S. But each of the factors

$$\overline{W}_{i-1} S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \overline{W}_i^{-1}$$

is either a $U_{G,S}$ or else the inverse of such an element, so the $U_{G,S}$ are a system of generators for $\mathfrak{U}$. One sees that it is essential to have set $\overline{U} = 1$.

Since there are different representative systems $\mathfrak{g}$ for the residue classes $\mathfrak{U}G_i$ modulo $\mathfrak{U}$ which satisfy the latter requirement there are also different systems of generators for $\mathfrak{U}$. We shall make use of this in Section 3.6 in order to bring the defining relations of $\mathfrak{U}$ into a clearly arranged form. But first we must carry out the determination of these relations.

3.2 Generators of the subgroup as special generators of the group

It is quite simple to give relations which the generators $U_{G,S}$ must satisfy: any relation R in the S_i certainly yields an element which also belongs to $\mathfrak{U}$, and hence may be expressed in terms of the $U_{G,S}$; the resulting representation of the identity element in $\mathfrak{U}$ is then a relation in the $U_{G,S}$. It is more difficult to clarify how one obtains all relations in the $U_{G,S}$. Naturally we cannot just say that each relation in the $U_{G,S}$ results from substitution in a relation in the S_i. Indeed we shall see that this is in general false.

We prepare for the solution of this problem by introducing the $U_{G,S}$ as new generators of the group $\mathfrak{F}$ subject to the relations

$$U_{GS}^{-1} GS \overline{GS}^{-1} \equiv 1$$

and give a somewhat modified procedure for expressing power products of in the S_i and $U_{G,S}$ which yield elements of $\mathfrak{U}$ in terms of the $U_{G,S}$ alone. As a more convenient

way of writing we denote the new generators of $\mathfrak{F}$ by $T_1, T_2, \ldots$ and their totality by $\mathfrak{t}$. A T_i is therefore a certain S_k or a certain $U_{G,S}$. Now if

$$F = T_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} T_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots T_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m} \tag{1}$$

is an arbitrary product in the T, we construct the subproducts

$$W_0 = 1, \quad W_1 = T_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1}, \quad W_2 = T_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} T_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad W_m = T_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} T_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots T_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m}$$

and, as in the previous section, taking $\overline{W}$ to be a certain power product G of the S_i which represents the residue class to which W belongs, we set

$$F' = \overline{W}_0 T_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \overline{W}_1^{-1} \overline{W}_1 T_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \overline{W}_2^{-1} \cdots \overline{W}_{m-1}^{-1} \overline{W}_{m-1} T_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m} \overline{W}_m^{-1}. \tag{2}$$

Again $\overline{W}_0 = 1$ and, if F belongs to $\mathfrak{U}$, also $\overline{W}_m = 1$, and thus F' is convertible into F by elementary manipulations. If we also express the terms $\overline{W}_{i-1} T_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \overline{W}_i^{-1}$, and in general the terms

$$G T^{\varepsilon} \overline{G T^{\varepsilon}}^{-1} \qquad \varepsilon = \pm 1, \tag{3}$$

where G and T run independently through the classes $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{t}$, in terms of the $U_{G,S}$ in a specific way, then we obtain a new rule for representing each F that belongs to $\mathfrak{U}$ in terms of the $U_{G,S}$.

If we now make the replacement

$$G T^{-1} \overline{G T^{-1}}^{-1} = \left(G' T \overline{G' T^{-1}} \right)^{-1}$$

where $G' = \overline{G T^{-1}}$, then in case $T_i = S_k$

$$G T_i \overline{G T_i}^{-1} \tag{4}$$

is replaced by U_{G,S_k}, and we express this by writing

$$|G T_i \overline{G T_i}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}} = U_{G,S_k}.$$

When the T in expression (4) corresponds to a $U_{G',S}$ and $G = 1$, so that $\overline{G T_i}^{-1} = 1$, we write $U_{G',S}$ for (4). If $G \neq 1$ and $T_i = U_{G',S}$ we suppose a rule is given, which we need not specify precisely, to replace the $U_{G'',S}$ in a power product $|G T_i \overline{G T_i}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}$ from expression (4). Since G and $\overline{G T_i}^{-1}$ contain only S generators we can proceed, e.g., by replacing $T_i = U_{G',S}$ by the product $G' S \overline{G' S}^{-1}$ in the S, and the resulting product $G U_{G',S} \overline{G U_{G',S}}^{-1}$ can be expressed in terms of the $U_{G,S}$ as in the previous section. We also denote this product by $|G T_i \overline{G T_i}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}$. If F is an arbitrary power product in the T which yields an element of $\mathfrak{U}$, then by $F_{\mathfrak{U}}$ we mean that product of the $U_{G,S}$ which consists of $F' = F$ in which the factors $\overline{W}_{i-1} T_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \overline{W}_i^{-1}$ are replaced by $|\overline{W}_{i-1} T_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \overline{W}_i^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}$, respectively $(|\overline{W}_{i-1} T_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \overline{W}_i^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}})^{-1}$, in the way just described.

To avoid misunderstanding, we emphasise that the symbol $|F_{\mathfrak{U}}|$ is defined only for the special elements (4) and that $|F_{\mathfrak{U}}|$ is in general different from $F_{\mathfrak{U}}$. As an abbreviation we set

$$|F^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}} = (|F|_{\mathfrak{U}})^{-1}.$$

3.3 Properties of the replacement process

We illuminate the connection between the products F and $F_{\mathfrak{U}}$ by the following theorems.

Theorem 1. *If F is a product of the $U_{G,S}$ alone, then $F_{\mathfrak{U}}$ is identical with F.*

Namely, if we construct the product F' in Section 3.2 (2) for such an element F in 3.2 (1) then $W_i = 1$ $(i = 1,2,\ldots,m)$ because all the factors of F belong to $\mathfrak{U}$.

Theorem 2. *If $F_1F_2 = F_{12}$ is the product of F_1 and F_2 written in juxtaposition, and if F_1 and F_2 belong to $\mathfrak{U}$, then*

$$F_{1\mathfrak{U}}F_{2\mathfrak{U}} = F_{12\mathfrak{U}}.$$

Namely, if

$$F_k = \prod_{l=1}^{m_k} T_{\alpha_{l,k}}^{\varepsilon_{l,k}} \quad (k = 1,2), \qquad W_{i,k} = \prod_{l=1}^{i} T_{\alpha_{l,k}}^{\varepsilon_{l,k}} \quad (i = 1,2,\ldots,m_k; k = 1,2)$$

then

$$F_{12} = \prod_{l=1}^{m_1} T_{\alpha_{l,1}}^{\varepsilon_{l,1}} \prod_{l=1}^{m_2} T_{\alpha_{l,2}}^{\varepsilon_{l,2}}.$$

The subproducts are

$$W_{i,12} = \prod_{l=1}^{i} T_{\alpha_{l,1}}^{\varepsilon_{l,1}} = W_{i,1} \quad (i \le m_1)$$

and for the subproducts

$$W_{i,12} = W_{m_1,12} \prod_{l=1}^{i-m_1} T_{\alpha_{l,2}}^{\varepsilon_{l,2}} \quad (i > m_1)$$

we have

$$\overline{W}_{i,12} = \overline{W}_{i-m_1,2}$$

because $W_{m_1,12}$ belongs to $\mathfrak{U}$ and $\overline{UF} = \overline{F}$. Thus $F'_{12} = F'_1F'_2$ and the assertion follows.

Theorem 3. *If F is a power product with*

$$\alpha_{i-1} = \alpha_i, \quad \varepsilon_{i-1} + \varepsilon_i = 0$$

and F^* is the product that results from F by striking out $T_{\alpha_{i-1}}^{\varepsilon_{i-1}} T_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$, then $F_{\mathfrak{U}}$ results from $F^*_{\mathfrak{U}}$ by elementary manipulations in the domain of the $U_{G,S}$.

Because if

$$F = \prod_{i=1}^{m} T_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}, \quad F^* = \prod_{i=1}^{m-2} T_{\beta_i}^{\eta_i}, \quad W_j = \prod_{l=1}^{j} T_{\alpha_l}^{\varepsilon_l}, \quad W_j^* = \prod_{l=1}^{j} T_{\beta_l}^{\eta_l},$$

then $W_j = W_j^*$ for $j \le i-2$. For $j > i-2$, W_j^* results from W_{j+2} by an elementary manipulation, hence $\overline{W_j^*} = \overline{W}_j$ for $j \le i-2$ and $\overline{W_j^*} = \overline{W}_{j+2}$ for $j > i-2$. If we now construct F' and F^* then

$$F' = \prod_{l=1}^{i-2} \overline{W}_{l-1} T_{\alpha_l}^{\varepsilon_l} \overline{W}_l^{-1} \cdot \overline{W}_{i-2} T_{\alpha_{i-1}}^{\varepsilon_{i-1}} \overline{W}_{i-1}^{-1} \cdot \overline{W}_{i-1} T_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \overline{W}_i^{-1} \cdot \prod_{l=i+1}^{m} \overline{W}_{l-1} T_{\alpha_l}^{\varepsilon_l} \overline{W}_l^{-1}$$

and by the identity just established

$$F^{*\prime} = \prod_{l=1}^{i-2} \overline{W}_{l-1} T_{\alpha_l}^{\varepsilon_l} \overline{W}_l^{-1} \cdot \prod_{l=i+1}^{m} \overline{W}_{l-1} T_{\alpha_l}^{\varepsilon_l} \overline{W}_l^{-1}.$$

If now ε_{i-1} is, say, $+1$ then ε_i is -1, hence

$$\overline{W}_{i-1} T_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \overline{W}_i^{-1} = (\overline{W}_{i-2} T_{\alpha_{i-1}} \overline{W}_{i-1}^{-1})^{-1}$$

and if we now express the factors

$$\overline{W}_{l-1} T_{\alpha_l}^{\varepsilon_l} \overline{W}_l^{-1}$$

in F' and $F^{*\prime}$ by the $U_{G,S}$ as prescribed, then the two factors for $l = i-1$ and $l = i$ in $F_{\mathfrak{U}}$ yield actual formally inverse components in the $U_{G,S}$.

From this we also have Theorem 4: *If F and F^{-1} are two formally inverse power products in the T which represent elements of $\mathfrak{U}$, then the corresponding products $F_{\mathfrak{U}}$ and $(F^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}}$ are likewise formally inverse to each other.* For, since FF^{-1} may be reduced to the identity by cancellation in the free group generated by the T, this also holds for $(FF^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}} = F_{\mathfrak{U}}(F^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}}$ in the free group generated by the $U_{G,S}$.

3.4 Defining relations

We have now completed the preparations needed to give the defining relations of $\mathfrak{U}$ in the generators $U_{G,S}$.

If

$$R_1(T), \quad R_2(T), \quad \ldots, \quad R_r(T)$$

is a system $\mathfrak{r}$ of defining relations of the group $\mathfrak{F}$ in the generators T, then we obtain a system of defining relations for $\mathfrak{U}$ in the generators $U_{G,S}$ by expressing the power products

$$GRG^{-1}$$

in terms of the $U_{G,S}$. Here R runs through all relations in $\mathfrak{r}$ and G through a complete system of representatives of the left-sided residue classes $\mathfrak{U}G$ of $\mathfrak{U}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$.

To see why, let R be any relation in the $U_{G,S}$. We can also regard it as a relation in the T, and hence it is a consequence of the relations R_i in $\mathfrak{r}$, so $R(U_{G,S})$ is, after renaming the $U_{G,S}$ in the corresponding T,

$$R(T) = \prod_i L_i(T) R_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}(T) L_i^{-1}(T).$$

That is, we obtain a product convertible into a product of transforms of the R from $\mathfrak{r}$ and their inverses in the free group generated by the T. By further manipulations in the free group on the T we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R(T) &= \prod L_i(T) R_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}(T) L_i^{-1}(T) \\ &= \prod (L_i(T)\overline{L}_i^{-1})(\overline{L}_i R_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \overline{L}_i^{-1})(\overline{L}_i L_i^{-1}(T)). \end{aligned}$$

Here the three bracketed elements belong to $\mathfrak{U}$, and the products $L_i\overline{L}_i^{-1}$ and $\overline{L}_i L_i^{-1}$ are formally inverse to each other. Now, on the one hand,

$$\left(\prod L_i(T)\overline{L}_i^{-1}\overline{L}_i R_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}\overline{L}_i^{-1}\overline{L}_i L_i^{-1}(T)\right)_{\mathfrak{U}}$$

results from $R(U_{G,S})$ by elementary manipulations in the domain of the $U_{G,S}$, by Theorems 1 and 3 of Section 3.3. And, on the other hand, this product equals

$$\prod (L_i\overline{L}_i^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}}(\overline{L}_i R_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}\overline{L}_i^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}}(\overline{L}_i L_i^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}}$$

by Theorem 2 of 3.3. Also, the $(L_i\overline{L}_i^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}}$ and $(\overline{L}_i L_i^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}}$ are formally inverse to each other by Theorem 4 of 3.3, and hence $R(U_{G,S})$ is a consequence relation of the $(GRG^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}}$.

3.5 SCHREIER'S normalized replacement process

The defining relations of $\mathfrak{F}$ in the generators T fall naturally into two classes: the class of relations that define the generators $U_{G,S}$ and the class of relations that originate from the defining relations of $\mathfrak{F}$ in the generators S. Correspondingly, we can also divide the defining relations of $\mathfrak{U}$ into two classes: *relations of the first kind*

$$(GR(S)G^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}} = 1, \tag{1}$$

and *relations of the second kind*

$$(G'U_{G,S}[GS\overline{GS}^{-1}]^{-1}G'^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}} = 1. \tag{2}$$

Following SCHREIER, we now show that, by skillful *use of the freedom which we still have in the definition of the process* $F_{\mathfrak{U}}$, we can eliminate the relations of the second kind. We can still decide how we shall express

$$G'U_{G,S}\overline{G'U}_{GS}^{-1}$$

in terms of the $U_{G',S}$ for $G' \neq 1$, i.e., how we shall define

$$|G'U_{G,S}\overline{G'U}_{GS}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}},$$

and we can choose the representatives of the residue classes G_i in many ways. We first determine the operation $|F|_{\mathfrak{U}}$ more exactly. Let

$$G'U_{G,S}[GS\overline{GS}^{-1}]^{-1}G'^{-1} = \prod_{i=1}^{m} T_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i},$$

let W_i be the subproducts of this expression, and in particular let

$$W_k = G', \quad \text{so} \quad T_{\alpha_k+1}^{\varepsilon_k+1} = U_{G,S}.$$

If we construct

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^{m} T_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}\right)' = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \overline{W}_{i-1} T_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \overline{W}_i^{-1},$$

then all T_{α_i} $(i \neq k+1)$ correspond to generators S, because the representatives G of the residue classes are power products of the S alone. Hence

$$|\overline{W}_{i-1} T_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \overline{W}_i^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}} \quad (i \neq k+1)$$

is a fixed power product of the $U_{G,S}$. We now set

$$|\overline{W}_k T_{\alpha_{k+1}}^{\varepsilon_{k+1}} \overline{W}_{k+1}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}, \quad \text{respectively} \quad |G' U_{G,S} \overline{G'U}_{GS}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}},$$

equal to

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k} |\overline{W}_{i-1} T_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \overline{W}_i^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\right)^{-1} \left(\prod_{i=k+2}^{m} |\overline{W}_{i-1} T_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \overline{W}_i^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\right)^{-1}.$$

This is permissible, because the product of the $U_{G,S}$ on the right hand side really represents the element

$$G' U_{G,S} \overline{G'S}_{GS}^{-1}$$

on the basis of the relation. This arrangement ensures that the relations

$$(G' U_{G,S} [GS\overline{GS}^{-1}]^{-1} G'^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}}$$

are identically satisfied, as long as $G' \neq 1$.

3.6 SCHREIER'S choice of representatives G

Now the only remaining relations of the second kind are the

$$(U_{G,S} [GS\overline{GS}^{-1}]^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}} \equiv 1.$$

We simplify them by a suitable choice of the representatives G. Namely, we impose the following condition on the G (SCHREIER'S condition):

(Σ) *Whenever*

$$G = \prod_{i=1}^{r} S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$$

is the representative of its residue class, then the initial segment products

$$\prod_{i=1}^{j} S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \quad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, r-1)$$

are also representatives of their residue classes.

This condition is always satisfiable:

In each residue class there is at least one power product

$$\prod_{i=1}^{l} S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \quad (\eta_i = \pm 1) \tag{1}$$

with the smallest possible number of factors l. We call l the length of the residue class determined by (1). $\mathfrak{U}$ is the unique residue class of length zero; for we have in it the empty power product, 1, which was chosen earlier as the representative of $\mathfrak{U}$. Now suppose that we have succeeded in choosing a representative, the expression for which satisfies condition (Σ) and has length equal to that of the residue class, for each residue class with length $< l$ ($l > 0$).

We will show that our condition can also be satisfied for residue classes of length l. Let $\mathfrak{U}F$ be a residue class of length l and let (1) be a power product of length l chosen from $\mathfrak{U}F$. Then we construct the residue classes

$$\mathfrak{U}\prod_{i=1}^{l-1} S_{\alpha_i}^{\eta_i}. \tag{2}$$

Their length is $l-1$. For (2) contains an expression of only $l-1$ factors, but if it contains a shorter expression

$$F = U\prod_{i=1}^{l-1} S_{\alpha_i}^{\eta_i}$$

then

$$FS_{\alpha_i}^{\eta_l} = U\prod_{i=1}^{l} S_{\alpha_i}^{\eta_i}$$

belongs to the residue class defined by (1) and has less than l factors, contrary to our assumption about $\mathfrak{U}F$. By the induction hypothesis, (2) therefore contains a product

$$\prod_{i=1}^{l-1} S_{\beta_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$$

which satisfies (Σ). Now we take

$$\prod_{i=1}^{l-1} S_{\beta_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \cdot S_{\alpha_i}^{\eta_l},$$

which must have length l, as representative of $\mathfrak{U}F$, and proceed similarly with all residue classes of length l. In this way our assertion is proved.

3.7 The relations of the second kind

We now assume that the representatives G satisfy (Σ). The elements $U_{G,S}$ are divided into two classes: $U_{G,S}$ is said to be of the first kind, or a member of $\mathfrak{u}_1$, if

$$\overline{GS} = GS$$

in the free group on the S. The remaining $U_{G,S}$ are said to be of the second kind and they comprise the class $\mathfrak{u}_2$. Now if $U_{G,S}$ is of the first kind then, because

$$GS\overline{GS}^{-1} = 1$$

in the free group on the S, it also follows that

$$(GS\overline{GS}^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}} = 1$$

in the free group on the $U_{G,S}$. That is, equation (2) of Section 3.5 can be replaced by

$$U_{G,S} = 1.$$

In other words: *the generators $U_{G,S}$ of class $\mathfrak{u}_1$ can be struck out, since they are equal to the identity.*

We now investigate the elements of the class $\mathfrak{u}_2$. Let

$$G = \prod_{i=1}^{r} S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}, \quad \overline{GS} = \prod_{k=1}^{s} S_{\beta_k}^{\eta_k}.$$

According to the rule for computing $(GS\overline{GS}^{-1})_{\mathfrak{u}}$ we have to introduce representatives of those residue classes which are determined by initial segments of the product

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r} S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} S \prod_{k=s}^{1} S_{\beta_k}^{-\eta_k}.$$

By condition (Σ) we have the following series of expressions:

$$\overline{W}_0 = \overline{W}_{r+s+1}, \quad \overline{W}_j = \prod_{i=1}^{j} S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \quad (j = 1,2,\ldots,r),$$

$$\overline{W}_{r+1} = \overline{GS} = \prod_{k=1}^{s} S_{\beta_k}^{\eta_k}, \quad \overline{W}_{r+i} = \prod_{k=1}^{s-i+1} S_{\beta_k}^{\eta_k} \quad (i = 2,3,\ldots,s).$$

The following relations hold. For $\varepsilon_j = +1$,

$$\overline{W}_{j-1} S_{\alpha_j}^{\varepsilon_j} = \overline{\overline{W}_{j-1} S_{\alpha_j}} = \overline{W}_j \quad (j \le r)$$

and for $\eta_{s-i+1} = -1$,

$$\overline{W}_{r+1} S_{\beta_{s-i+1}}^{-\eta_{s-i+1}} = \overline{\overline{W}_{r+1} S_{\beta_{s-i+1}}} = \overline{W}_{r+i+1}.$$

For $\varepsilon_j = -1$,

$$\overline{W}_j S_{\alpha_j}^{-\varepsilon_j} = \overline{\overline{W}_j S_{\alpha_j}} = \overline{W}_{j-1} \quad (j \le r)$$

and for $\eta_{s-i+1} = +1$,

$$\overline{W}_{r+i+1} S_{\beta_{s-i+1}}^{\eta_{s-i+1}} = \overline{\overline{W}_{r+i+1} S_{\beta_{s-i+1}}} = \overline{W}_{r+i},$$

possibly after manipulations in the free group of the S. Consequently, the elements

$$|\overline{W}_{j-1}S_{\alpha_j}^{\varepsilon_j}\overline{W}_j^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}, \quad |\overline{W}_{r+1}S_{\beta_{s-i+1}}^{\eta_{s-i+1}}\overline{W}_{r+i-1}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}$$

are all equal to $U_{G,S}$ from the class $\mathfrak{u}_1$, or inverses of such elements, and thus equal to 1, so

$$(GS\overline{GS}^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}} = |GS\overline{GS}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}$$

and the equation in question reduces to the identity

$$U_{G,S}U_{G,S}^{-1} = 1.$$

To summarize, we have arrived at the following: by suitable choice of the expressions $|F|_{\mathfrak{U}}$ in Section 3.5, which are independent of the others, the equations (2) in 3.5 for $G \neq 1$ are eliminated, so that only the equations for $G = 1$ remain. If, in addition, the representatives of the residue classes are chosen so as to satisfy condition (Σ) in 3.6 then the result is that the relations of the second kind may be replaced by those which say that the

$$U_{G,S} \quad \text{for which} \quad \overline{GS} = \overline{G}S$$

are equal to the identity.

Another remark on the computation of relations: if

$$G = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1}S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2}\cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m}$$

and

$$R = S_{\beta_1}^{\eta_1}S_{\beta_1}^{\eta_1}\cdots S_{\beta_n}^{\eta_n}$$

then the subproducts W_i of GRG^{-1} are

$$W_j = \prod_{i=1}^{j} S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \qquad (j = 1,2,\ldots,m)$$

$$W_{m+k} = G\prod_{i=1}^{k} S_{\beta_i}^{\eta_i} \qquad (k = 1,2,\ldots,n)$$

$$W_{m+n+l+1} = GR\prod_{r=m}^{m-l} S_{\alpha_r}^{-\varepsilon_r} \qquad (l = 0,1,\ldots,m-1).$$

Since

$$\overline{GRG'} = \overline{GG'},$$

because RF and F denote the same element in $\mathfrak{F}$, then

$$\overline{W}_l = \overline{W}_{m+n+m-l}$$

and hence

$$|\overline{W}_l S_{\alpha_{l+1}}^{\varepsilon_{l+1}}\overline{W}_{l+1}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}} = |\overline{W}_{m+n+m-l}S_{\alpha_{l+1}}^{\varepsilon_{l+1}}\overline{W}_{m+n+m-l-1}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}.$$

Therefore, $(GRG^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}}$ is converted by suitable transformations into

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} |\overline{W}_{m+i-1} S_{\beta_i}^{\eta_i} \overline{W}_{m+i}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}.$$

If G satisfies the conditions (Σ) then the collection of all the elements $U_{G,S}$ determined by the initial segments of G is contained in the class $\mathfrak{u}_1$, and can therefore be left out.

The relationships obtained between the generators and defining relations of a subgroup may be derived quite quickly in another way.[2] Let $\mathfrak{T}$ be the free group on the generators T_i of $\mathfrak{F}$, $\mathfrak{R}$ the invariant subgroup determined by the defining relations $R_i(T)$, so $\mathfrak{F}$ equals $\mathfrak{T}/\mathfrak{R}$; let $\mathfrak{U}$ be a subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}$, and $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{T}}$ that subgroup of $\mathfrak{T}$ the power products of which yield elements of $\mathfrak{U}$. $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{T}}$ contains $\mathfrak{R}$, since all elements of $\mathfrak{R}$ are representable by the identity element of $\mathfrak{F}$ and hence of $\mathfrak{U}$. Thus the residue classes $\mathfrak{U}G$ of $\mathfrak{U}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$ consist exactly of power products of the residue classes $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{T}}L$ modulo $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{T}}$ in $\mathfrak{T}$, and a full system of representatives $N_i(T)$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots)$ for the $\mathfrak{U}G$ is at the same time a full system of representatives for the $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{T}}L$.

Thus we have: the generators $U_{G,S}$ of $\mathfrak{U}$ are at the same time a system of generators for the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{T}}$ and in fact they yield a system of free generators of $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{T}}$ if the N_i satisfy the SCHREIER condition and those $U_{G,S}$ that equal 1 are left out.

We now ask more about the determination of $\mathfrak{R}$ as a subgroup of $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{T}}$. The elements R of $\mathfrak{R}$ are power products of the elements $L(T)R_k(T)L^{-1}(T)$, where L is an arbitrary element of $\mathfrak{T}$. Now if $L = U\overline{L}$, where $\overline{L}$ is the representative of the residue class $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{T}}L$ and U belongs to $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{T}}$, then $LRL^{-1} = U\overline{L}R\overline{L}^{-1}U^{-1}$; thus the elements of $\mathfrak{R}$ may be composed from the elements $N_iR_kN_i^{-1}$ and their transforms in $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{T}}$. Consequently, these $N_iR_kN_i^{-1}$, expressed in terms of the $U_{G,S}$, yield a system of defining relations of $\mathfrak{U}$.

3.8 Invariant subgroups

If the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ is an invariant subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}$ then each F from $\mathfrak{U}$ yields an automorphism of $\mathfrak{U}$ by the transformation

$$FUF^{-1} = U',$$

as we saw in Section 1.12. We now show that we can determine these automorphisms.

Obviously an automorphism

$$\boldsymbol{A}(F) = F'$$

of a group $\mathfrak{F}$ is determined when

$$\boldsymbol{A}(S) = S'$$

is given for all generators S. Because, since

$$\boldsymbol{A}(F_1)\boldsymbol{A}(F_2) = \boldsymbol{A}(F_1F_2),$$

[2] W. HUREWICZ, Hamb. Abhandl. **5**, 1930, 307.

we have

$$\boldsymbol{A}(S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m}) = \boldsymbol{A}(S_{\alpha_1})^{\varepsilon_1} \boldsymbol{A}(S_{\alpha_2})^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots \boldsymbol{A}(S_{\alpha_m})^{\varepsilon_m}$$

for each power product in the S. Applying this to the group $\mathfrak{U}$ with the generators $U_{G,S}$, we need only determine the elements

$$FU_{G,S}F^{-1},$$

i.e., we need only express the products

$$FU_{G,S}F^{-1}$$

in terms of the $U_{G,S}$ for all G in $\mathfrak{g}$ and S in $\mathfrak{m}$. But this is possible immediately from the process in Section 3.2. As F runs through all elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ we obtain the totality of automorphisms of $\mathfrak{U}$, which is a group. The automorphisms

$$SUS^{-1} = U',$$

as S runs through the class $\mathfrak{m}$, can obviously be chosen as generators of this group.

3.9 Subgroups of special groups

We now go to a few applications. If $\mathfrak{F}$ is a free group, then each subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ of $\mathfrak{F}$ is a free group, as follows immediately from Section 3.7, generated by the $U_{G,S}$ in the class $\mathfrak{u}_2$.[3] It is in fact the case that *if $\mathfrak{F}$ is a group with generators*

$$S_1, \quad S_2, \quad \ldots, \quad S_n$$

and the relations

$$S_i^{a_i} \equiv 1, \qquad a_i \geq 0,$$

then each subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ of $\mathfrak{F}$ has a presentation with the generators $U_{G,S}$ and defining relations of the form

$$U_{G,S}^{u_{G,S}} \equiv 1.$$

We prove this for the case where the $a_i \neq 0$ are all prime numbers. The residue classes of

$$GS_i^r, \quad 0 \leq r < a_i$$

are either disjoint or all identical. Namely, if

$$\mathfrak{U}GS_i^{r_1} = \mathfrak{U}GS_i^{r_2}, \quad r_1 < r_2,$$

then also

$$\mathfrak{U}G = \mathfrak{U}GS_i^{(r_2-r_1)}.$$

Further,

$$\mathfrak{U}GS_i^{(r_2-r_1)} = \mathfrak{U}GS_i^{2(r_2-r_1)},$$

[3] Other proofs may be found in Sections 4.17, 4.20, and 7.12. For the literature see the work of O. SCHREIER cited on p. 57 and F. LEVI, Math. Zeit. **32**, (1930), 315.

so

$$\mathfrak{U}G = \mathfrak{U}GS_i^{2(r_2-r_1)},$$

and hence in general

$$\mathfrak{U}G = \mathfrak{U}GS_i^{k(r_2-r_1)}.$$

But, by Section 1.3, $k(r_2-r_1)$ runs through all residue classes (mod a_i) and hence $\mathfrak{U}GS_i^{k(r_2-r_1)}$ runs through all the residue classes $\mathfrak{U}GS_i^r$.

Further, if

$$\mathfrak{U}GS_i^{r_i} = \mathfrak{U}G'S_i^{r_i'}$$

then the residue classes

$$\mathfrak{U}G' \text{ and } \mathfrak{U}GS_i^{r_i-r_i'}$$

coincide, and in general so do the residue classes

$$\mathfrak{U}G'S_i^{r'} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{U}GS_i^{r_i-r_i'+r'}.$$

We now consider the consequence relations of the $S_i^{a_i}$ in the $U_{G,S}$. They read

$$\prod_{r=0}^{a_i-1} \left| \overline{GS_i^r} S_i \overline{GS_i^{r+1}}^{-1} \right|_{\mathfrak{U}} = 1. \tag{1}$$

Now if the same generators appear in two such relations then for two different representatives G and G' we must have

$$\left| \overline{GS_i^{r_i}} S_i \overline{GS_i^{r_i+1}}^{-1} \right|_{\mathfrak{U}} = \left| \overline{G'S_i^{r_i'}} S_i \overline{G'S_i^{r_i'+1}}^{-1} \right|_{\mathfrak{U}}$$

and hence also

$$\mathfrak{U}G'S_i^{r_i'} = \mathfrak{U}GS_i^{r_i}$$
$$\mathfrak{U}G'S_i^{r} = \mathfrak{U}GS_i^{r_i-r_i'+r}$$

so that the product

$$\prod_{r=0}^{a_i-1} \left| \overline{G'S_i^{r}} S_i \overline{G'S_i^{r+1}}^{-1} \right|_{\mathfrak{U}}$$

must result from (1) by a cyclic interchange, and hence is a consequence of (1). By omitting these superfluous relations we can reach a stage where each generator $U_{G,S}$ apears in at most one defining relation of $\mathfrak{U}$. But in such a relation either all the $U_{G,S}$ are the same, in which case the relation has the form

$$U_{G,S}^{u_{G,S}} = 1,$$

or else the $U_{G,S}$ appearing in the relation are formally different. In the latter case either these $U_{G,S}$ all belong to the class $\mathfrak{u}_1$ and hence equal the identity, or else they appear as different elements of the class $\mathfrak{u}_2$, in which case all but one of these generators can be eliminated by expressing them in terms of the others. Thus our assertion is proved.

3.10 Generators and defining relations of the congruence subgroup $\mathfrak{U}_p$

It follows from the result of the previous section that, e.g., all subgroups of the modular group have relations of the form

$$S_i^{a_i} \equiv 1 \quad \text{with} \quad a_i = 2 \text{ or } 3$$

for suitable choice of generators S_i. We check this for the congruence subgroups $\mathfrak{U}_p$ and establish the number of these relations.[4]

As generators of the modular group we take S and T with the defining relations

$$S^2 \equiv 1, \quad (ST)^3 \equiv 1.$$

The representatives of the residue classes $\mathfrak{U}_p M$ introduced in Section 1.9 are $G_k = ST^k$ $(k = 0, 1, \ldots, p-1)$ These products satisfy the condition (Σ) in 3.6. We now construct the generators U as in 3.1.

$$U_{G_k,T} = G_k T \overline{G_k T}^{-1} = ST^k T (ST^{k+1})^{-1} \qquad (k = 0, 1, \ldots, p-2)$$
$$U_{E,S} = S\overline{S}^{-1} = SS^{-1}$$

belong to the class $\mathfrak{u}_1$, the others to the class $\mathfrak{u}_2$. We have

$$U_{E,T} = T; \quad U_{G_{p-1},T} = G_{p-1} T \overline{G_{p-1} T}^{-1} = ST^p S^{-1};$$
$$U_{G_0,S} = S^2; \quad U_{G_k,S} = G_k S \overline{G_k S}^{-1} = ST^k S \overline{ST^k S}^{-1} \qquad (k = 1, 2, \ldots, p-1)$$

In order to determine the representatives

$$\overline{G_k S} = \overline{ST^k S} = G_{k^*}$$

we compute the substitution corresponding to

$$ST^k S = G_k S,$$

namely

$$x' = \frac{-1}{-\frac{1}{x} + k} = \frac{-x}{kx - 1}.$$

By Section 1.9

$$k k^* \equiv -1 \pmod{p}, \quad 0 < k^* < p$$

and so

$$U_{G_k,S} = ST^k ST^{-k^*} S^{-1}.$$

Now for the relations! They read:

$$(S^2)_{\mathfrak{U}} \equiv 1; \quad \left((ST)^3\right)_{\mathfrak{U}} \equiv 1; \quad (G_k S^2 G_k^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}} \equiv 1; \quad \left(G_k (TS)^3 G_k^{-1}\right)_{\mathfrak{U}} \equiv 1$$
$$(k = 0, 1, \ldots, p-1).$$

[4] For the next two sections cf. H. RADEMACHER, Hamb. Abhandl. **7**, (1930), 134.

We begin with the consequences of the first relation,

$$\begin{aligned}(S^2)_{\mathfrak{U}} &= |SG_0^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|G_0S|_{\mathfrak{U}} = U_{E,S}U_{G_0,S} = U_{G_0,S} \equiv 1,\\ (G_0S^2G_0^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}} &= |G_0S|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|SG_0|_{\mathfrak{U}} = U_{G_0,S}U_{E,S} = U_{G_0,S} \equiv 1,\\ (G_kS^2G_k^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}} &= |G_kS\overline{G_kS}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|\overline{G_kS}SG_k^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}} = U_{G_k,S}U_{G_{k^*},S} \equiv 1 \qquad (1)\end{aligned}$$

The relations for G_k and G_{k^*} are convertible into each other by cyclic interchange. By omission of superfluous relations one can thus reach the stage where each generator appears in only one relation.

Now for the consequences of the second relation:

$$\begin{aligned}(STSTST)_{\mathfrak{U}} =& |SG_0^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|G_0TG_1^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|G_1S\overline{G_1S}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|\overline{G_1S}T\overline{G_1ST}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\\ &\cdot|\overline{G_1ST}S\overline{G_1STS}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|\overline{G_1STS}T\overline{G_1STST}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}.\end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\overline{G_1S} = G_{p-1}$, and hence $\overline{G_1ST} = G_0$, it follows by omitting the generators already known to be equivalent to 1 that

$$U_{G_1,S}U_{G_{p-1},T}U_{E,T} \equiv 1. \qquad (2)$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(G_k(ST)^3G_k^{-1}\right)_{\mathfrak{U}}\\ &= |G_kS\overline{G_kS}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|\overline{G_kS}T\overline{G_kST}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|\overline{G_kST}S\overline{G_kSTS}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\\ &\quad\cdot|\overline{G_kSTS}T\overline{G_kSTST}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|\overline{G_kSTST}S\overline{G_kSTSTS}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|\overline{G_kSTSTS}T\overline{G_kSTSTST}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\\ &= |G_kS\overline{G_kS}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|\overline{G_kS}T\overline{G_kST}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|\overline{G_kST}S\overline{G_kSTS}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\\ &\quad\cdot|\overline{G_kSTS}T\overline{G_kT^{-1}S}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|\overline{G_kT^{-1}S}S\overline{G_kT^{-1}}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|\overline{G_kT^{-1}}TG_k^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}.\end{aligned}$$

In order to determine the factors $U_{G,T}$ more precisely we must determine the residue classes $\overline{G_kS}$, $\overline{G_kSTS}$, $\overline{G_kT^{-1}}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{G_kS} &= G_{k^*} \text{ for } k \neq 0,\ \overline{G_0S} = E,\\ \overline{G_kSTS} &= \overline{G_kT^{-1}ST^{-1}} = G_{(k-1)^*-1} \text{ for } k \neq 1,\ = E \text{ for } k = 1,\\ \overline{G_kT^{-1}} &= G_{k-1} \text{ for } k \geq 1,\ = G_{p-1} \text{ for } k = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus the $U_{G,T}$ which do not belong to $\mathfrak{u}_1$ appear in the first place for $k = 0$ and 1, in the second place for $k = 1$, in the last place for $k = 0$. Hence we completely determine the relations for G_0 and G_1 first. One sees that

$$G_1(ST)^3G_1^{-1} = (ST)^3$$

in the free group on S and T, and hence also

$$\left(G_1(ST)^3G_1^{-1}\right)_{\mathfrak{U}} = \left((ST)^3\right)_{\mathfrak{U}}$$

in the free group on the U, and that

$$G_0(ST)^3G_0^{-1} = S(ST)^3S^{-1} = S^2T(ST)^3T^{-1}S^{-2}$$

in the free group on S and T and hence

$$\left(G_0(ST)^3G_0^{-1}=S(ST)^3S^{-1}\right)_{\mathfrak{U}}=\left(S^2T\right)_{\mathfrak{U}}\left((ST)^3\right)_{\mathfrak{U}}\left(T^{-1}S^{-2}\right)_{\mathfrak{U}}$$

in the free group on the U, and consequently these relations can be omitted, as consequence relations of $\left((ST)^3\right)_{\mathfrak{U}}$.

There remain the relations free of the $U_{G,T}$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(G_k(ST)^3G_k^{-1}\right)_{\mathfrak{U}}\\ &=|G_kS\overline{G_kS}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|\overline{G_kST}\,S\overline{G_kSTS}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\,|\overline{G_kSTST}\,S\overline{G_kSTSTS}^{-1}|_{\mathfrak{U}}\\ &(k=2,3,\ldots,p-1).\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

One sees that the relations for

$$G_k, G_{k^*+1}=\overline{G_kST} \text{ and } G_{(k^*+1)^*+1}=\overline{G_k(ST)^2}$$

are convertible into each other by cyclic interchange, and one concludes as in Section 3.9 that two relations (3) are always convertible into each other by cyclic interchange when they contain the same generators. Thus by omitting superfluous relations one can reach the stage where each generator in (3) appears in only one relation. It is clear, just as in Section 3.9, that the three generators that appear in a relation are either all equal or all different.

For the process $k'=k^*+1$ this says

$$k'''=((k^*+1)^*+1)^*+1=k$$

and, if two of the numbers

$$k,\quad k'=k^*+1,\quad k''=(k^*+1)^*+1$$

are equal, then they are all equal.

3.11 The relations $U_{G,S}^{u_{G,S}}$ of the group $\mathfrak{U}_p$

The reduction of the presentation of $\mathfrak{U}_p$, by elimination of suitable $U_{G,T}$ until only relations of the form

$$U_{G,S}^{u_{G,S}}=1\tag{3.1}$$

remain, will not be carried out in general. Here we shall work under the assumption that only relations of the form (1) appear, i.e., that $k=k^*$ and $k^*+1=k$. For the number of relations (1) that remain after omission of superfluous ones, see the work cited in Section 3.10. There one finds an elimination process for the $U_{G,S}$.

If $x^*=x$ then

$$x^2\equiv -1 \pmod p,$$

and conversely, if $y=y^*+1$ then

$$yy^*=y(y-1)\equiv -1 \pmod p.$$

It must then be that

$$y^2 - y + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p} \tag{2}$$

or

$$(2y-1)^2 \equiv -3 \pmod{p}. \tag{3}$$

Conversely, each solution of the congruence (2) follows from that of (3) and hence

$$y = y^* + 1.$$

Now the theory of quadratic forms[5] shows that the congruence

$$x^2 \equiv a \pmod{p} \tag{4}$$

(for p an odd prime number) has either no solutions or two when a is not divisible by p, and a is called a quadratic residue when the congruence (4) is solvable, otherwise a nonresidue. We let

$$\left(\frac{a}{p}\right)$$

be the symbol which equals $+1$ or -1 according as a is a quadratic residue or nonresidue (mod p).

Now $\left(\frac{-1}{p}\right) = +1$ when $p = 4n+1$, for any integer n, otherwise it equals -1, and $\left(\frac{-3}{p}\right) = +1$ when $p = 3n+1$, otherwise it equals -1.

Because of this, there are either exactly two $U_{G,S}$ with $U_{G,S}^2 = 1$, or else none, according as $p = 4n+1$ or not, and there are two $U_{G,S}$ with $U_{G,S}^3 = 1$ according as $p = 3n+1$ or not. For $p = 2$, (4) has the solution $x \equiv 1$, for $p = 3$, (3) has the solution $y \equiv -1 \pmod{3}$.

We give a few more numerical examples.

Firstly, we can always eliminate $U_{G_0,S}$ by Section 3.10, (1), and $U_{G_{p-1},T}$ with the help of Section 3.10, (2).

In the case $p = 2$ only two generators remain,

$$U_{E,T}, \quad U_{G_1,S},$$

and the relation

$$U_{G_1,S}^2 \equiv 1.$$

For $p = 3$ the generators remaining are

$$U_{E,T}, \quad U_{G_i,S} \quad (i = 1,2)$$

with the relations

$$U_{G_1,S} U_{G_2,S} \equiv 1, \quad U_{G_i,S}^3 \equiv 1.$$

We can eliminate $U_{G_2,S}$ and obtain $U_{G_1,S}$ with $U_{G_1,S}^3 \equiv 1$.

[5] Specifically, the quadratic reciprocity theorem. (Translator's note.)

In the case $p=5$ there remain initially

$$\begin{gathered} U_{E,T}, \quad U_{G_i,S} \quad (i=1,2,3,4) \\ U_{G_1,S}U_{G_4,S} \equiv 1, \quad U_{G_2,S}^2 \equiv 1, \quad U_{G_3,S}^2 \equiv 1, \\ U_{G_1,S}U_{G_3,S}U_{G_4,S} \equiv 1. \end{gathered}$$

We eliminate $U_{G_1,T}$ and $U_{G_4,T}$ and obtain

$$U_{E,T}, \quad U_{G_i,S}; \qquad U_{G_i,S}^2 \equiv 1 \quad (i=2,3).$$

For $p=7$ we get

$$U_{E,T}, \quad U_{G_i,S}; \qquad U_{G_i,S}^3 \equiv 1 \quad (i=3,5).$$

For $p=11$ we get the free group with the generators

$$U_{E,T}, \quad U_{G_i,S} \quad (i=4,6).$$

3.12 Commutator groups

In the factor group modulo the commutator subgroup it can always be decided whether two power products belong to the same residue class, hence a system of representatives for these residue classes, and thereby generators of the commutator subgroup, may always be given.

We now focus on the case where $\mathfrak{F}$ is determined by two generators S_1, S_2 and a relation $R(S_1,S_2)$, and the factor group $\mathfrak{A}$ of $\mathfrak{F}$ by the commutator subgroup $\mathfrak{K}$ is infinite cyclic.

Let

$$R(S) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} S_1^{s_{1i}} S_2^{s_{2i}}$$

and

$$s_k = \sum_{i=1}^{m} s_{ki} \quad (k=1,2),$$

so

$$R'(S) = S_1^{s_1} S_2^{s_2} \equiv 1$$

is the defining relation of $\mathfrak{A}$. And, since $\mathfrak{A}$ is an infinite cyclic group, the greatest common divisor of s_1 and s_2, (s_1,s_2), must be 1. If $s_2=0$, then $s_1=\pm 1$. If s_1 and s_2 are both $\neq 0$ then new generators s_1' and s_2' may always be introduced, and the relation $R(S)$ converted to

$$R(S') = \prod_{i=1}^{m'} S_1'^{s'_{1i}} S_2'^{s'_{2i}},$$

so that

$$s_1' = \sum_{i=1}^{m'} s'_{1i} = 0.$$

This follows by induction from the following fact: if

$$|s_1| > |s_2| \quad \text{and} \quad s_1 = ns_2 + r_1 \quad (0 \le r_1 < |s_2|)$$

and if the generators S_i' are introduced by

$$S_2' = S_2 S_1^n, \quad S_1' = S_1,$$

then

$$R(S') = \prod_{i=1}^{m'} S_1'^{s_{1i}} (S_2' S_1'^{-n})^{s_{2i}}$$

and therefore

$$s_1' = s_1 + ns_2 = r_1.$$

We now suppose that

$$s_1' = 0, \quad s_2' = 1$$

and write S and K for S_1' and S_2' respectively, in order to indicate that $S_2' = K$ belongs to the commutator subgroup $\mathfrak{K}$. The elements

$$G_s = S^s \quad (s = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots)$$

then represent all the residue classes $\mathfrak{K}F$. They satisfy the condition (Σ). An element

$$\prod_{i=1}^{l} S^{s_i} K^{k_i} \quad \text{belongs to the residue class } \mathfrak{K}G_s \text{ with} \quad s = \sum_{i=1}^{m} s_i.$$

So generators of $\mathfrak{K}$ are the elements

$$U_{G_s,S} = S^s S \overline{S^{s+1}}^{-1},$$

which belong to the class $\mathfrak{u}_1$, and

$$U_{G_s,K} = S^s K S^{-s} = K_s \quad (s = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots),$$

which belong to the class $\mathfrak{u}_2$.

Now let

$$R(S,K) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} S^{r_i} K^{\varepsilon_i} S^{-r_i}. \tag{1}$$

Then

$$G_s R G_s^{-1} = \prod_{i=1}^{m} S^{r_i+s} K^{\varepsilon_i} S^{-r_i-s}, \tag{2}$$

and hence all relations

$$(G_s R G_s^{-1})_{\mathfrak{U}} \tag{3}$$

result from $(R)_{\mathfrak{U}}$ when K_i is replaced by K_{i+s}.

The automorphism induced in $\mathfrak{K}$ by transformation by S is determined by

$$SK_sS^{-1} = K_{s+1}.$$

The collection of elements from the residue classes $\mathfrak{K}S^{gn}$ (g fixed; $n = 0, \pm1, \pm2, \ldots$) is an invariant subgroup $\mathfrak{K}_g$ of $\mathfrak{F}$. The elements

$$G_i = S^i \quad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, g-1)$$

form a complete system of representatives for the residue classes $\mathfrak{K}_g F$. Consequently, the elements

$$U'_{G_i,S}, \quad U'_{G_i,K} \quad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, g-1)$$

form a system of generators for $\mathfrak{K}_g$. The

$$U'_{G_i,S} \quad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, g-2)$$

belong to the class $\mathfrak{u}_1$, while

$$U'_{G_{g-1},S} = S^g, \quad U'_{G_i,K} = S^i K S^{-i} \quad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, g-1)$$

belong to the class $\mathfrak{u}_2$. The defining relations of $\mathfrak{K}_g$ are

$$R_i = (S^i R S^{-i})_{\mathfrak{U}} \quad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, g-1).$$

They result from the relations (2) when one sets

$$U_{G_k,S} = U'^{l}_{G_{g-1},S} U'_{G_i,S} U'^{-l}_{G_{g-1},S}$$

with

$$l\,g + i = k \quad \text{for} \quad (0 \le i < g).$$

If we make the elements of the commutator subgroup commute and set $SKS^{-1} = K^x$, then we obtain a group with operator determined by the generator K and the relation

$$K^{f(x)} \equiv 1, \tag{4}$$

which follows from (1). This is because the relations resulting from (2) are

$$K^{x^i f(x)}$$

and hence they are consequence relations of (4) in the sense of Section 2.14.

3.13 The Freiheitssatz (the freeness theorem)

By considering invariant subgroups with infinite cyclic factor groups one can solve the word problem for groups with one defining relation. This is achieved by the following, so-called Freiheitssatz,[6][7] formulated by DEHN, which states:

[6] It is usual to use the German name for this theorem. (Translator's note.)

[7] W. MAGNUS, J. für reine und angew. Math. **163**, (1930), 3.

If S_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,n)$ are generators of a group $\mathfrak{G}$ with one defining relation $R(S_i)$ which is a short word in the sense of Section 2.4 and which properly contains S_n, then the group generated by the S_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,n-1)$ is free.

The theorem holds if R does not contain the generators S_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,n-1)$, because $\mathfrak{G}$ is then the free product of the free group on the S_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,n-1)$ and the group generated by S_n with $R(S_n) \equiv 1$.

We can then carry out the proof by complete induction on the length $l(R)$, which is the sum of the absolute values of the exponents of all S_i in R, and assume the theorem proved for $l-1$, because for $l = 1$ we must have $R = S_n^{\pm 1}$. We can also assume that all S_i really appear in R.

By allowing factors to commute, R may be brought into the form

$$S_1^{r_1} S_2^{r_2} \cdots S_n^{r_n}.$$

We first make the assumption *that r_n is zero.* With addition of the relations $S_i \equiv 1$ $(i = 1,2,\ldots,n-1)$, $\mathfrak{G}$ yields the free group with one generator S_n, and if we set

$$S_n^i S_k S_n^{-i} = S_{ki}$$

and denote the relations resulting from $S_n^i R S_n^{-i}$ by introducing the S_{lm} by $R_i(S_{lm})$, then R_i results from R_{i-1} when each S_{lm} is replaced by $S_{l,m+1}$, and the power products $R_i(S_{lm})$ thus have the same length l', and in fact $l' < l$ because in R_i no element corresponds to the factors S_n^k.

By $\mathfrak{G}_{ik}$ we mean the group presented on those generators that appear in R_i, R_{i+1}, $\ldots$, R_{i+k-1}, and the S_{lm} for which $m_1 < m < m_2$ and S_{lm_1} and S_{lm_2} both appear in $R_i, R_{i+1}, \ldots$ or R_{i+k-1}, and with the defining relations $R_i, R_{i+1}, \ldots, R_{i+k-1}$.

By $\mathfrak{U}_i$ we mean the group with generators common to $\mathfrak{G}_{i1}$ and $\mathfrak{G}_{i+1,1}$. Obviously $\mathfrak{U}_i$ is a proper subgroup of $\mathfrak{G}_{i1}$ and $\mathfrak{G}_{i+1,1}$, and hence it is a free group by the induction hypothesis. It follows that $\mathfrak{G}_{i,k+1}$ is the free product of $\mathfrak{G}_{i,k}$ and $\mathfrak{S}_{i+k,1}$ with the amalgamated subgroup $\mathfrak{U}_{i+k}$ (Section 2.7). Finally, let $\mathfrak{B}_{ika}$ be those subgroups of $\mathfrak{G}_{ik}$ generated by the elements S_{la} (a fixed; $l = 1,2,\ldots,n-1$) appearing among the generators of $\mathfrak{G}_{ik}$. The groups $\mathfrak{B}_{i1a}$ are free groups with the free generators S_{la}, for generators appearing in R_i cannot have the same second index, since it was assumed that S_n did not appear in R. Thus it follows from the induction hypothesis that the $\mathfrak{B}_{i1a}$ are free groups. However, $\mathfrak{B}_{i,k+1,a}$ is the free product of $\mathfrak{B}_{ika}$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{i+k,1a}$ and hence likewise a free group on the free generators S_{la} (Section 2.7).

Now we can derive an absurdity from the assumption that a relation $R'(S)$ between the S_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,n-1)$ follows from R, because R' would yield a relation between the S_{la}.

The considerations are similar *when r_k is nonzero* and one of the r_i, say r_1, is zero. By addition of relations $S_i = 1$ $(S_i = 2,3,\ldots,n)$ we get the free cyclic group with generator S_1. Now let

$$S_1^i S_k S_1^{-i} = S_{ki}$$

and let R_i be the relation resulting from $S_1^i R S_1^{-i}$ by introduction of the S_{lm}. We retain the definition of the $\mathfrak{G}_{ik}$ and $\mathfrak{U}_i$, and understand $\mathfrak{S}_{ik}$ to be the subgroup of $\mathfrak{G}_{ik}$ generated by the S_{lm} from $\mathfrak{G}_{ik}$ with $l \neq n$. $\mathfrak{G}_{ik}$ is free, because one S_{nk} properly appears

in R_i, and it again follows from the properties of free products with amalgamated subgroups that all the $\mathfrak{S}_{ik}$ are free groups with free generators S_{lm} $(l \neq n)$. If there were a relation R' between the S_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,n-1)$ alone, then this would have a relation between the S_{lm} $(l \neq n)$ as a consequence.

If all $r_i \neq 0$ and $n = 2$ then a relation for S_1 alone cannot follow from R. Namely, if

$$\prod L_i R_i^{\varepsilon_i} L_i^{-1} = S_1^a$$

then it follows, when we allow the factors on the left side to commute and set $\sum \varepsilon_i = \varepsilon$, that the left side becomes $S_1^{\varepsilon r_1} S_2^{\varepsilon r_2}$. Consequently, we must have $\varepsilon = 0$ and hence also $a = 0$.

Finally, if all $r_i \neq 0$ and $n \geq 3$ we extend the group $\mathfrak{G}$ by a generator T_1 with the relation

$$T_1^{r_2} S_1^{-1} = 1.$$

If the group with the generators $T_1, S_2, \ldots, S_{n-1}$ is free, so also is the group generated by $T_1^{r_2} = S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_{n-1}$, being a subgroup of a free group (Section 3.9), and in fact $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_{n-1}$ are free generators.

In place of S_2 we introduce the new generator T_2 into R by

$$S_2 = T_1^{-r_1} T_2.$$

Suppose $R(S)$ is converted into $\overline{R}(T,S)$ by elimination of S_1 and S_2. If we make the T commute with the S then the element T_1 disappears. Further, if we construct the invariant subgroup generated by

$$T_1^i T_2 T_1^{-i} = T_{2i}, \quad T_1^i S_k T_1^{-i} = S_{ki}$$

and express

$$T_1^i \overline{R}(T,S) T_1^{-i} = \overline{R}_i$$

in terms of the T_{2i}, S_{ki}, then this results in a word of length l' less than that of R. For no factors in $\overline{R}_i$ correspond to the T_1^k from $\overline{R}$, and the sum of the absolute values of the remaining terms is equal to the sum of the exponent values of the factors of R different from S_1. Thus the group generated by $T_1, T_2, S_3, \ldots, S_{n-1}$ is a free group with these free generators.

Among the consequences of the Freiheitssatz, one deserves particular attention:[8]

If $\mathfrak{G}$ and $\mathfrak{G}'$ are two groups with generators S_i, S_i' respectively, and defining relations $R(S), R'(S')$ respectively, and if the correspondence $\boldsymbol{I}(S_i) = S_i'$ is an isomorphism between $\mathfrak{G}$ and $\mathfrak{G}'$, then $\boldsymbol{I}(R(S))$ is an element which results from $R'(S')$ by transformation in the free group of the S. For more on the solution of the word problem in groups with one defining relation we refer to W. MAGNUS (Math. Ann. **106**, 295).

[8] For proof see MAGNUS loc. cit.

3.14 Determination of automorphisms

A general procedure for determining the automorphism group from the generators and defining relations is not known. We shall collect the most important results. If S_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,n)$ are generators of a group then an automorphism $\boldsymbol{A}$ is determined when the elements $\boldsymbol{A}(S_i) = S_i'$ are known as power products of the S_i. This is because any power product of the S_i then goes to the element resulting from formal replacement of the S_i by S_i'.

Given a *free commutative group* with n free generators S_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,n)$ and an automorphism

$$\boldsymbol{A}(S_i) = S_1^{a_{i1}} S_2^{a_{i2}} \cdots S_n^{a_{in}},$$

the determinant of the a_{ik} must equal ± 1; this is because the elements $S_i' = \boldsymbol{A}(S_i)$ must again be free generators of the group and the equations

$$\prod_i S_i'^{x_i} = \prod_k S_k^{b_k},$$

respectively

$$\sum a_{ik} x_k = b_k,$$

must therefore be satisfied. Conversely, any substitution with determinant ± 1 defines an automorphism.

Now suppose we have a *free group* $\mathfrak{S}$ *with free generators* S_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,n)$. A closed presentation of the automorphism group must be very intricate, but it is worth asking about its generators and defining relations.

The automorphisms of $\mathfrak{S}$ include all permutations of the S_i,

$$\boldsymbol{A}(S_i) = S_{k_i} \quad (i = 1,2,\ldots,n). \tag{1}$$

Furthermore, the elements

$$\boldsymbol{A}(S_1) = S_1^{-1}, \quad \boldsymbol{A}(S_i) = S_i \quad (i \neq 1) \tag{2}$$

and the elements

$$\boldsymbol{A}(S_1) = S_1 S_2, \quad \boldsymbol{A}(S_i) = S_i \quad (i \neq 1) \tag{3}$$

are again systems of free generators, because one can represent the S_i in terms of the $\boldsymbol{A}(S_i)$. NEILSEN[9] showed that these operations generate the automorphism group of $\mathfrak{S}$.

The automorphisms $\boldsymbol{A}(S_i) = S_i'$ obviously induce certain automorphisms in the factor group $\mathfrak{F}$ by the commutator subgroup. One obtains them by bringing the power products for the S_i' into the form

$$S_1^{a_{i1}} S_2^{a_{i2}} \cdots S_n^{a_{in}}$$

by transposition of factors. Since $\mathfrak{F}$ is a free ABELIAN group, the determinant of the a_{ik} must equal ± 1.

[9] J. NIELSEN, Math. Ann. **79** (1919), 269, and **91** (1924), 169.

Conversely, each automorphism of a free ABELIAN group $\mathfrak{F}$ is induced by an automorphism of $\mathfrak{S}$. Namely, if one considers the S_i in (1), (2), and (3) as generators of $\mathfrak{F}$, then one sees that all automorphisms of $\mathfrak{F}$ may be composed from the automorphisms (1), (2), and (3).

A beautiful result of NIELSEN[10] sharpens this connection in the case of the free group $\mathfrak{S}_2$ on two generators.

If $\boldsymbol{A}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{A}_2$ are two automorphisms of $\mathfrak{S}_2$ which induce the same automorphism in the factor group by the commutator subgroup, then there is an inner automorphism $\boldsymbol{I}$ of $\mathfrak{S}_2$ such that $\boldsymbol{I}$ composed with $\boldsymbol{A}_1$ yields $\boldsymbol{A}_2$, i.e., $\boldsymbol{A}_2 = \boldsymbol{I}\boldsymbol{A}_1$.

The results for *free products of finite cyclic groups* are much simpler. We consider only groups[11] with two generators S_1, S_2 and the relations

$$S_1^{a_1} \equiv S_2^{a_2} \equiv 1, \quad a_1 > a_2. \tag{4}$$

The automorphisms are then given by the equations

$$\boldsymbol{A}(S_1) = LS_1^{r_1}L^{-1}, \quad \boldsymbol{A}(S_2) = LS_2^{r_2}L^{-1}$$

where r_i and a_i are relatively prime to each other.

It is clear, first of all, that that the given transformations are automorphisms. Conversely, in automorphisms $\boldsymbol{A}(S_i) = S_i'$ the element S_i' must have order a_i, from which it follows by Section 2.6 that the S_i' must be transforms of $S_1^{l_1}$, $S_2^{l_2}$ respectively. But the two S_i' cannot be transforms of powers of the same element S_b. Because power products of the S_i' would then all belong to residue classes, modulo the commutator subgroup, represented by S_b^n ($n = 0, \pm 1, \ldots$). Thus we must have

$$\boldsymbol{A}(S_1) = LS_1^{r_1}L^{-1}, \quad \boldsymbol{A}(S_2) = MS_2^{r_2}M^{-1}.$$

Then

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{A}}(S_1) = M^{-1}LS_1^{r_1}L^{-1}M, \quad \overline{\boldsymbol{A}}(S_2) = S_2^{r_2}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{A}^*(S_1) = S_2^l M^{-1}LS_1L^{-1}MS_2^{-l}, \quad \boldsymbol{A}^*(S_2) = S_2$$

are also automorphisms. The element $S_2^l M^{-1}LS_1L^{-1}MS_2^{-l}$ may now be reduced by the method of Section 2.6, and l chosen, so that the reduced form begins and ends with $S_1^{\pm m}$. Now if $\boldsymbol{A}^*(S_1)$ were different from S_1, say equal to NS_1N^{-1}, then each power product of the $\boldsymbol{A}^*(S_i)$ which contained S_1 at all would also contain the product N, which is impossible.

Closely related to the above are the automorphisms of the *group* $\mathfrak{G}$ *with generators* S_1, S_2 *defined by*[12]

$$S_1^{a_1}S_2^{a_2} \equiv 1, \quad a_1 > a_2.$$

As we saw in Section 2.6, the infinite cyclic subgroup generated by $S^{a_1} = D$ is the center $\mathfrak{Z}$, and the factor group by $\mathfrak{Z}$ is the group defined by (4). An automorphism $\boldsymbol{A}$

[10] J. NIELSEN, Math. Ann. **78** (1918), 385.

[11] O. SCHREIER, Hamb. Abhandl. **3** (1924), 167.

[12] In the special case $a_1 = 3$, $a_2 = 2$ the automorphisms were found by M. Dehn, Math. Ann. **75** (1914), 402. In this case the group is the group of the trefoil knot, and DEHN used its automorphisms to show that the left trefoil knot is not deformable into the right trefoil knot. (Translator's note.)

of $\mathfrak{G}$ carries the center into itself and must induce automorphisms in $\mathfrak{Z}$ on the one hand and in the factor group $\mathfrak{G}/\mathfrak{Z}$ on the other. The only automorphisms of $\mathfrak{Z}$ are $\boldsymbol{A}(D)=D$ and $\boldsymbol{A}(D)=D^{-1}$. Hence

$$(\boldsymbol{A}(S_1))^{a_1}=S_1^{\varepsilon a_1}=D^{\varepsilon},\quad (\boldsymbol{A}(S_2))^{a_2}=S_2^{\varepsilon a_2}=D^{-\varepsilon}\quad (\varepsilon=\pm 1); \tag{5}$$

because of the second condition an automorphism of $\mathfrak{G}$ must have the form

$$\boldsymbol{A}(S_i)=MS_i^{r_i}M^{-1}D^{s_i}=MS_i^{r_i+a_is_i'}M^{-1}$$

where

$$s_1'=s_1,\quad s_2'=-s_2.$$

Then because of (5) we must have

$$(r_i+a_is_i')a_i=\varepsilon a_i,$$

so

$$r_i+a_is_i'=\varepsilon.$$

Thus we have: the automorphisms of the group $\mathfrak{G}$ are

$$\boldsymbol{A}(S_i)=MS_i^{\varepsilon}M^{-1}\quad (\varepsilon=\pm 1;\ i=1,2).$$

Chapter 4

Line Segment Complexes

4.1 The concept of a line segment complex

We now turn to the simplest objects of combinatorial topology, the line segment complexes. In particular, we have to consider paths in line segment complexes and coverings of line segment complexes, two concepts which facilitate the connection between line segment complexes and groups.

By a *line segment complex*[1] $\mathfrak{C}$ we mean a finite or denumerably infinite collection of points and line segments. The relations "is the initial point of," "is the final point of," and "is equal but oppositely directed" between these objects may be explained with the help of the following declarations.

A.1. *If s is a segment then there is always a point p_1 which is the initial point of s, and a point p_2 which is the final point of s.*

A.2. *If s is a segment then there is a single oppositely directed segment equal to s, $s' = s^{-1}$. The oppositely directed segment equal to s^{-1}, namely $(s^{-1})^{-1}$, is s.*

A.3. *If p_1 and p_2 are initial and final points of s, then p_2 and p_1, respectively, are the initial and final points of s^{-1}.*

If p is an initial or final point of s then p is called a boundary point of s, and we say that p bounds s. If the initial and final points p_1 and p_2 of s are different then the point pair p_1, p_2 is called the boundary of s. If $p_1 = p_2 = p$ then s is called a *singular* segment and p is called the boundary of s. If all points and segments of a complex $\mathfrak{C}'$ also belong to the complex $\mathfrak{C}$, and if the boundary relations in $\mathfrak{C}'$ also hold in $\mathfrak{C}$, then $\mathfrak{C}'$ is called a *subcomplex* of $\mathfrak{C}$.

Now let the pairs of equal but oppositely directed line segments be given a fixed numbering, with one segment of the pair associated with the symbol $s_i = s_i^1$ and the other with s_i^{-1}. Finitely many line segments, given in a certain order,

$$w = S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m} \quad (\varepsilon_i = \pm 1) \tag{1}$$

[1] The reader may prefer the shorter term *graph* or *1-complex*. However, since Reidemeister uses not only the term "Streckencomplex" but also its parts "Strecken" (line segments) and "Complex" (complex) I have decided to keep them all. It may be wordy, but at least the words fit together better than "graph," "edge," and "complex." (Translator's note.)

constitute a *path* when the final point of $S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$ is the initial point of $S_{\alpha_{i+1}}^{\varepsilon_{i+1}}$.

Thus w "traverses" the segments $S_{\alpha_i}^{\pm 1}$. A path (1) is called "reduced" when it is never the case that

$$\alpha_i = \alpha_{i+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_{i+1} = 0$$

hold simultaneously. Striking out or inserting two such segments is called reduction or extension of a path, respectively. A path is called open or closed according as the initial point p of $S_1^{\varepsilon_1}$ and the final point p' of $S_n^{\varepsilon_n}$ coincide or not. An open path "leads" from p to p' or "connects" p with p'. A path (1) is called *simple* if the endpoints of the segments $S_i^{\varepsilon_i}$ are all different from each other. The *length of a path* is the number m of segments which it contains. If (1) is a path then

$$S_{\alpha_k}^{\varepsilon_k} S_{\alpha_{k+1}}^{\varepsilon_{k+1}} \cdots S_{\alpha_{k+l}}^{\varepsilon_{k+l}} \quad (1 \leq k, k+l \leq m)$$

is also a path, which will be called a subpath of (1). The path

$$w^{-1} = S_{\alpha_m}^{-\varepsilon_m} \cdots S_{\alpha_2}^{-\varepsilon_2} S_{\alpha_1}^{-\varepsilon_1}$$

is called the oppositely directed path equal to (1). If a path is not simple, then it contains a closed subpath. One easily shows: if there is a path connecting different points p and p' then there is also a simple path connecting p and p'. It consists of the original with the closed subpaths deleted.

By a *tour* we mean a path which traverses each segment only once. If w in (1) is a tour then

$$S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \neq S_{\alpha_k}^{\varepsilon_k} \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \neq S_{\alpha_k}^{-\varepsilon_k} \quad \text{when } i \neq k.$$

A complex is called *connected* if any two points are connected by a path of finitely many segments. A complex which is not connected consists of a finite or denumerable number of disjoint, connected subcomplexes, which may be called its *components*.

Examples of complexes may be constructed so easily from, e.g., euclidean segments that we shall not describe them further.

4.2 Orders of points. Regular complexes

A few questions that come up with finite complexes are the following. Let a_0 be the number of points of $\mathfrak{C}$, $2a_1$ the number of directed segments, where equal but oppositely directed segments are counted separately. If k segments begin at a point, then k is called the *order*[2] *of the point*. Let r_k be the number of points of order k. Then

$$\sum k\, r_k = 2a_1,$$

where the sum is taken over all points. Further, let

$$\sum r_{2l+1} = r^{(1)}$$

[2]Today, k is more commonly called the *degree* of the point, but in this book the word "degree" is used only when the order is constant. (Translator's note.)

be the number of points of odd order. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum k r_k &= \sum 2l\, r_{2l} + \sum (2l+1) r_{2l+1} \\ &= 2\sum l\, r_{2l} + 2\sum l\, r_{2l+1} + r^{(1)},\end{aligned}$$

so $r^{(1)} = 2r$ is always an even number.

If the same number, k, of segments begin at each point then the complex is called *regular of degree* k. This concept is also meaningful for complexes with infinitely many elements. If k is odd and the number of points is finite, then a_0 must be even because the number of segments $2a_1$ is in this case equal to $a_0 k$. The regular complexes with $k = 1$ are decomposable into $\frac{1}{2}a_0$ components, each consisting of a nonsingular segment and two points. The connected regular complexes with $k = 2$ consist either of one point, a singular segment, and its inverse; or secondly of a finite number of points $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_{a_0}$ and a_0 segments $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_{a_0}$ together with their inverses. With suitable orientation and numbering, s_i begins at p_i and ends at p_{i+1} (for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, a_0 - 1$) or p_1 (for $i = a_0$). The third case is infinitely many points $p_0, p_1, p_{-1}, p_2, p_{-2}, \ldots$ and segments $s_0, s_1, s_{-1}, s_2, s_{-2}, \ldots$; with suitable orientation and numbering, s_i begins at p_i and ends at p_{i+1}. If $k > 2$ then it is difficult to obtain a general view of the regular complexes.

4.3 The Königsberg bridge problem

One of the first topological questions to be asked was whether a connected complex could be traversed in a single tour. The so-called Königsberg bridge problem is a problem requiring a tour of a particular complex, and EULER[3] showed that it is impossible by proving the following general theorem: *let* $\mathfrak{C}$ *be connected and with only finitely many points and segments. If all points of the complex are of even order then* $\mathfrak{C}$ *may be traversed by a closed tour. If, on the other hand,* $\mathfrak{C}$ *contains* $2r$ *points of odd order, then there are* r *paths*

$$w_1, \quad w_2, \quad \ldots, \quad , w_r,$$

and no fewer, which together traverse each segment of $\mathfrak{C}$ *exactly once.*

It is clear that there can be no fewer than r paths of the kind required, because only the initial and final point of the tour can be of odd order. If $\mathfrak{C}$ can be traversed in m tours than

$$2r \leq 2m.$$

Now to show that exactly r tours exist first look at the case where all points are of even order. If w is any tour of $\mathfrak{C}$ which begins at p_1 and ends at p_2, then if $p_1 \neq p_2$ there is an odd number of segments which begin at p_2. There is consequently a segment emanating from p_2 which is not traversed by w, and thus w can be prolonged. If $p_1 = p_2$ then w is closed and one possibility is that there is a point p on w which still bounds a segment not traversed by w. We then let w' be the closed path that results from a cyclic interchange of w and begins at p, and we can prolong w' from p.

[3] Petrop. Comm. **8** (1741), 128.

Otherwise, w traverses all segments emanating from points through which it passes, so that the points and segments of w form a component of $\mathfrak{C}$, which must be $\mathfrak{C}$ itself, since $\mathfrak{C}$ is connected.

It follows that there must be a tour containing all segments of $\mathfrak{C}$, and this tour must be closed, otherwise odd numbers of segments would emanate from its initial and final points.

Now if $\mathfrak{C}$ is a complex with $r \neq 0$ we construct a complex $\mathfrak{C}'$ with $r' = 0$ by adding r nonsingular segments which connect the points of odd order with each other in pairs. Then $\mathfrak{C}'$ may be traversed by a tour, and if we remove from it the segments not belonging to $\mathfrak{C}$ this tour falls into exactly r subtours.

4.4 Trees

A complex is called a tree if it is connected and no reduced closed paths may be constructed from its segments.

It follows that all segments of a tree are nonsingular and that all reduced paths in a tree are open and simple. Two points of a tree may be connected by only one reduced path. Namely, if w and w' are two such paths, then $w w'^{-1}$ is a closed path. The latter may be shortened by cancelling neighboring equal but oppositely directed segments until finally all segments are removed. Hence $w = w'$. It also follows from this fact that if

$$S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i} S_{\alpha_{i+1}}^{\varepsilon_{i+1}} \cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m}$$

is a reduced path which connects the point p_1 to the point p_2, and if the final point of $S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$ is the point p_3, then

$$S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$$

is the reduced path that connects p_1 to p_3.

If a complex $\mathfrak{C}$ is connected, and if each point p of $\mathfrak{C}$ can be connected with any point p' by only a single reduced path, then $\mathfrak{C}$ is a tree. If p is an arbitrary point of the tree, and if w_i are the simple paths from p to all other points p_i of the tree, then any segment s_k appears in all w_i with the same exponent ε. Supposing it appeared in w_{i1} with $\varepsilon = +1$ and in w_{i2} with $\varepsilon = -1$, there would be a subpath w'_{i1} of w_{i1} ending with s_k, and a subpath w'_{i2} of w_{i2} ending at the endpoint of s_k, but not with s_k itself. Then $w'_{i1} w'^{-1}_{i2}$ would be a closed reduced path, which is a contradiction. Thus one can label the segments in such a way that all segments in the w_i have $\varepsilon = 1$ and the path w_i to p_i ends with s_i. Then p_i is the final point of only one segment, with which w_i ends. The point p is the initial point of all segments which it bounds. Thus, if a finite tree $\mathfrak{B}$ contains a_0 points, then $\mathfrak{B}$ contains

$$a_1 = a_0 - 1 \tag{1}$$

pairs of oppositely directed equal segments.

After these preliminary remarks we demonstrate the important theorem: *if $\mathfrak{C}$ is a connected complex containing at least two distinct points p_1 and p_2, then there is a*

subcomplex $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{C}$ which contains all points of $\mathfrak{C}$ and is a tree.[4]

We first suppose that $\mathfrak{C}$ contains only finitely many points,

$$p_1, \quad p_2, \quad \cdots, \quad p_{a_0},$$

and prove the theorem under this hypothesis by complete induction. In the base case there is a tree $\mathfrak{B}_2$ which contains p_1 and p_2, because there is a simple line segment connecting p_1 to p_2 and the complex consisting of the two points and the pair of oppositely directed line segments between them is a tree because it contains no simple closed path.

Now if $\mathfrak{B}_i$ is a tree which contains the points

$$p_1, \quad p_2, \quad \cdots, \quad p_i,$$

then either p_{i+1} already occurs in this tree, in which case $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1} = \mathfrak{B}_i$, or else

$$S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_k}^{\varepsilon_k} S_{\alpha_{k+1}}^{\varepsilon_{k+1}} \cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m}$$

is a simple path which connects p_1 with p_{i+1}. There is then a value $k \leq m$ such that the subpath

$$S_{\alpha_k}^{\varepsilon_k} S_{\alpha_{k+1}}^{\varepsilon_{k+1}} \cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m}$$

has no point in common with $\mathfrak{B}_i$ apart from its initial point. We now construct the complex $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}$ consisting of the points and segments of $\mathfrak{B}_i$ together with the segments

$$S_{\alpha_k}^{\pm 1}, \quad S_{\alpha_{k+1}}^{\pm 1}, \cdots \quad S_{\alpha_m}^{\pm 1}$$

and their boundary points. Then $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}$ is a tree, and $\mathfrak{B}_{a_0}$ is the tree sought.

We now suppose that $\mathfrak{C}$ contains denumerably many points $p_1, p_2, \ldots$. By applying the process for finite $\mathfrak{C}$ here we obtain an infinite sequence of subcomplexes $\mathfrak{B}_i$ which are trees consisting of finitely many elements and which contain the points p_k for $k < i$. By $\mathfrak{B}$ we mean the complex containing all the points and segments occurring in the $\mathfrak{B}_i$. These are all the points of $\mathfrak{C}$. Furthermore, $\mathfrak{B}$ is a tree. Namely, if there were a closed reduced path in $\mathfrak{B}$ then it would also be in the $\mathfrak{B}_k$ containing all of the (finitely many) segments in this path, and this is a contradiction because $\mathfrak{B}_k$ is a tree.

4.5 The connectivity number

If $\mathfrak{C}$ is a tree, then the complex $\mathfrak{B}$ in $\mathfrak{C}$ constructed above is identical with $\mathfrak{C}$ itself. For if a segment, s say, did not appear in $\mathfrak{B}$ then the complex $\mathfrak{C}$ would not be a tree. If s is a singular segment this is clear. If s is not singular, let w be the simple path in $\mathfrak{B}$ running from the final point of s to the initial point of s. Then sw is a simple closed path and so $\mathfrak{C}$ is not a tree. If $\mathfrak{C}$ is not a tree, then there are either singular segments in $\mathfrak{C}$ or else different subcomplexes which are trees containing all the points of $\mathfrak{C}$.

[4] Such a subcomplex $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{C}$ is today called a *spanning tree* of $\mathfrak{C}$. In future I will often use phrases such as "Let $\mathfrak{B}$ be a spanning tree of $\mathfrak{C}$" in place of Reidemeister's phrases such as "Let $\mathfrak{B}$ be a tree which is a subcomplex of $\mathfrak{C}$ containing all points of $\mathfrak{C}$." (Translator's note.)

Let $\mathfrak{B}$ be such a tree and let s be a nonsingular segment of $\mathfrak{C}$ not occurring in $\mathfrak{B}$. We now construct the complex $\mathfrak{C}'$ which results from $\mathfrak{B}$ by the addition of s. Let w be the path in $\mathfrak{B}$ which leads from the final point p_2 to the initial point p_1 of s. Then sw is a simple path, and indeed up to cyclic interchange and reversal of direction it is the only simple closed path in $\mathfrak{C}'$. This is because, if w' is a simple closed path, then it cannot run entirely in $\mathfrak{B}$ and hence must contain s or s^{-1}; say, containing s and beginning with p_1. With the removal of s we obtain from w' a simple path w^* in $\mathfrak{B}$ running from p_2 to p_1, so $w^* = w$ and $w' = sw$. Now if s' is any segment of $\mathfrak{B}$ contained in w, then

$$w = w_1 s' w_2.$$

Let $\mathfrak{B}'$ be the complex which results from $\mathfrak{C}$ by elimination of s'. $\mathfrak{B}'$ contains all the points of $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{B}'$ is a tree different from $\mathfrak{B}$. A tree $\mathfrak{B}'$ which results from $\mathfrak{B}$ in this way is called a *neighbor* of $\mathfrak{B}$.

If $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B}^*$ are two spanning trees of $\mathfrak{C}$, and if there are exactly $2k$ segments appearing in $\mathfrak{B}^*$ but not in $\mathfrak{B}$, then $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{B}^*$ if $k = 0$, $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B}^*$ are neighbors if $k = 1$, and there is a chain of neighboring trees

$$\mathfrak{B}, \quad \mathfrak{B}^{(1)}, \quad \mathfrak{B}^{(2)}, \quad \ldots, \quad \mathfrak{B}^{(k)}$$

with $\mathfrak{B}^{(k)} = \mathfrak{B}^*$ in case $k > 1$.

If $k = 0$, then all segments of $\mathfrak{B}^*$ belong to $\mathfrak{B}$. For if $\mathfrak{B}$ contained a segment which did not appear in $\mathfrak{B}^*$, $\mathfrak{B}^*$ would not be a tree, because $\mathfrak{B}^*$ contains all points of $\mathfrak{C}$ by hypothesis and addition of a further segment to $\mathfrak{B}^*$ gives a complex which is not a tree.

If $k \geq 1$, let s_1 be a segment occuring in $\mathfrak{B}^*$ but not in $\mathfrak{B}$. The path w in $\mathfrak{B}$ from the final point of s_1 to the initial point then itself contains a segment s_1' which does not appear in $\mathfrak{B}^*$, otherwise $\mathfrak{B}^*$ would contain the simple closed path $s_1 w$. We now construct $\mathfrak{B}^{(1)}$ from $\mathfrak{B}$ by adding s_1 and removing s_1'. Then $\mathfrak{B}^*$ contains only $2(k-1)$ segments which do not appear in $\mathfrak{B}^{(1)}$. Thus by iteration of the process we come to a tree $\mathfrak{B}^{(k)}$ which contains all the segments that $\mathfrak{B}^*$ does.

By the connectivity number of a connected complex $\mathfrak{C}$ we mean the number of segment pairs of $\mathfrak{C}$ which do not appear in a spanning tree $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{C}$. The connectivity number of a tree is therefore 0. If the connectivity number is $a > 0$ we first have to show that the a associated with complex is unique. We suppose that $\mathfrak{C}$ contains $2a$ more segments than the tree $\mathfrak{B}$ and $2a'$ more than the tree $\mathfrak{B}'$, where $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B}'$ each contain all the points of $\mathfrak{C}$ and a is finite. Now if $\mathfrak{B}'$ contains $2k$ segments which do not belong to $\mathfrak{B}$, then $k \leq a$. If $k = 0$ then $\mathfrak{B}$ is identical with $\mathfrak{B}'$, so $a = a'$. If $k = 1$ then $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B}'$ are neighbors and, as one easily sees, $a = a'$. If $k > 1$ there is a chain of neighboring trees $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{B}^{(1)}, \mathfrak{B}^{(2)}, \ldots, \mathfrak{B}^{(k)} = \mathfrak{B}'$ beginning with $\mathfrak{B}$ and ending with $\mathfrak{B}'$. Since $a^{(i)} = a^{(i+1)}$ always holds for the number $a^{(i)}$ of segments of $\mathfrak{C}$ not belonging to $\mathfrak{B}^{(i)}$, we have $a = a'$.

One can also give an easy indirect proof that: if $\mathfrak{C}$ contains infinitely many more segments than one spanning tree $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{C}$, then $\mathfrak{C}$ contains infinitely many more segments than any such tree.

For complexes containing only finitely elements, a may be easily computed. *If a_0 is the number of points, and $2a_1$ the number of segments, then the connectivity*

number

$$a = -a_0 + a_1 + 1.$$

For a tree, this follows from (1) of Section 4.4. Another proof for trees with finitely many segments is the following: it is correct for the tree with a single pair of segments; here $a_0 = 2$. Supposing that the theorem is true for $a_1 = k$, we prove it for $a_1 = k+1$. Let $\mathfrak{B}$ be a tree with a_0 points and $2a_1 = 2(k+1)$ segments, with p an arbitrary point and w_i the unique simple path from p to p_i. All of these paths have finite length, hence there is among them one of greatest length, w_m, which leads to p_m. But then p_m can only bound the segment s_m with which w_m ends, and s_m can appear in no reduced path connecting p to the other p_i. Then if we remove p_m and s_m from $\mathfrak{B}$ we again obtain a connected complex, and in fact a tree with $a_0 - 1$ points and $2(a_1 - 1) = 2k$ segments, so

$$0 = (a_0 - 1) - (a_1 - 1) - 1 = a_0 - a_1 - 1,$$

as was to be proved.

If now $\mathfrak{C}$ is an arbitrary complex with a_0 points and $2a_1$ segments, and if $\mathfrak{B}$ is a spanning tree of $\mathfrak{C}$, hence with a_0 points, then $\mathfrak{B}$ contains exactly $2(a_0 - 1)$ segments, and if a is the connectivity number of $\mathfrak{C}$ then $\mathfrak{C}$ contains

$$a_1 = a + a_0 - 1$$

segment pairs. This is the equation claimed.

4.6 The fundamental group of a line segment complex

Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a connected line segment complex, and let p_0 be one of its points. The closed paths in this complex emanating from p_0 determine a group when we admit the empty path consisting of p_0 alone and make the following definition: two such paths are called equivalent when they may be converted into each other by expansion and reduction. One concludes easily, as we did in Section 2.2, that this relation is symmetrical and transitive. Each path is equivalent to a reduced path when we also admit the empty path consisting of p_0 alone. One concludes further, as in Section 2.3, that a path is equivalent to a single reduced path, so that only one reduced path appears in each class of equivalent paths. The class of closed paths emanating from p_0 in which w appears will be denoted by $[w]$. By the product $[w_1][w_2]$ of two classes we mean the class $[w_1 w_2]$, and one concludes as in Section 2.2 that the classes form a group under this multiplication, called the *fundamental group*[5] of $\mathfrak{C}$ with basepoint p_0. The class containing the empty path plays the role of the identity, and $[w^{-1}]$ is the class inverse to $[w]$. The *groupoid* (Section 1.15) of classes of arbitrary equivalent paths may be defined similarly. The identities of the latter correspond to the points of $\mathfrak{C}$.

[5] Reidemeister calls it the *Wegegruppe* ("path group," not unreasonably), but I have decided to use the term "fundamental group," since it is now used universally. However, Reidemeister's notation is easier to understand knowing that "Weg" is the German word for path. This explains the notation w for paths, and (from Section 6.1 onwards) the notation $\mathfrak{W}$ (fraktur W) for the fundamental group. (Translator's note.)

If $\mathfrak{C}$ is a tree, then the fundamental group consists only of the identity. If $\mathfrak{C}$ is not a tree then there is a reduced closed path, and hence also one which begins at p_0. The fundamental group is therefore more than just the identity. In general it may be shown that *if a is the connectivity number of $\mathfrak{C}$, then the fundamental group is a free group with a free generators.* To show this, let $\mathfrak{B}$ be a spanning tree of $\mathfrak{C}$. Let

$$s_1, \quad s_2, \quad \ldots, \quad s_k$$

be the segments which, together with their inverses, do not appear in $\mathfrak{B}$. Let $p_{i,1}$ be the initial point, and $p_{i,2}$ the final point, of the segment s_i. Also let $w_{i,1}$ and $w_{i,2}$ be simple paths in $\mathfrak{B}$ which lead from p_0 to $p_{i,1}$ and $p_{i,2}$ respectively. We now construct the closed path

$$w_{i,1} s_i w_{i,2}^{-1}$$

beginning at p_0, set

$$[w_{i,1} s_i w_{i,2}^{-1}] = S_i,$$

and assert that the S_i are generators of the fundamental group. To express an element $[w]$ in terms of the S_i, we take the reduced path w' contained in $[w]$. If w' is not empty, then w' runs through finitely many of the segments s_i in succession, say m of them. If s_{α_1} is the first of these segments to appear in w', then w' first leaves the tree $\mathfrak{B}$ at the point $p_{\alpha_1,1}$ or $p_{\alpha_1,2}$, according as s_{α_1} is traversed in the positive or negative sense. If we assume the former, then w' begins with $w_{\alpha_1,1} s_{\alpha_1}$, say

$$w' = w_{\alpha_1,1} s_{\alpha_1} w''.$$

Then

$$S_{\alpha_1}^{-1}[w'] = [w_{\alpha_1,2} w'']$$

contains a path which traverses only $m-1$ segments s_i in succession, and the same holds also for the reduced path in this class. It then follows by induction that if

$$s_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1}, \quad s_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad s_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m}$$

are the segments $s_i^{\pm 1}$ which w' traverses successively in the positive direction, then in the class

$$S_{\alpha_m}^{-\varepsilon_m} S_{\alpha_{m-1}}^{-\varepsilon_{m-1}} \cdots S_{\alpha_1}^{-\varepsilon_1}[w']$$

there is a path which traverses none of the segments s_i. Thus the path is entirely contained in $\mathfrak{B}$ and may be converted to the empty path by reduction.

We still have to see how the different generating systems of the fundamental group depend on the different choices of the tree $\mathfrak{B}$. Let $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B}'$ be two neighboring trees. Let $s' = s_1$ be the segment that is in $\mathfrak{B}'$ but not in $\mathfrak{B}$, and s the segment that is in $\mathfrak{B}$ but not in $\mathfrak{B}'$. Let

$$s_{\alpha_1}, \quad s_{\alpha_2}, \quad \cdots$$

be those segments s_i $(i = 1, 2, \ldots)$ whose endpoints both remain connected to p_0 after removal of s from $\mathfrak{B}$, let

$$s_{\beta_1}, \quad s_{\beta_2}, \quad \cdots \quad (s_{\gamma_1}, \quad s_{\gamma_2}, \quad \cdots)$$

be those for which this holds for the initial point (respectively, final point) but not for the final point (respectively, initial point), and let

$$s_{\delta_1}, \quad s_{\delta_2}, \quad \cdots$$

be those for which it holds for neither the initial or final point. Then the simple paths from p_0 in $\mathfrak{B}'$ to $p_{\alpha_i,1}, p_{\alpha_i,2}, p_{\beta_i,1}, p_{\beta_i,2}$ are identical with those in $\mathfrak{B}$; those from p_0 to $p_{\beta_i,2}, p_{\gamma_i,1}, p_{\delta_i,1}, p_{\delta_i,2}$, on the other hand, always pass through s', and indeed all in the positive direction (cf. Section 4.4) with a suitable orientation of $s' = s_1$. Now let

$$S'_i = [w'_{i1} s_i w'^{-1}_{i2}] \quad (i > 1)$$

be the generators corresponding to the paths s_i relative to $\mathfrak{B}'$, let w'_1 be the path in $\mathfrak{B}'$ from p_0 to the initial point of s, and w'_2 that to the final point of s, so

$$S'_1 = [w'_1 s w'^{-1}_2]$$

is the missing generator relative to $\mathfrak{B}'$. Then one sees that either w'_1 or w'_2, but not both, passes through the segment s. It then follows that

$$S'_1 = S_1^{\pm 1}, \quad S'_{\alpha_i} = S_{\alpha_i}, \quad S'_{\beta_i} = S_{\beta_i} S_1^{-1},$$
$$S'_{\gamma_i} = S_1 S_{\gamma_i}, \quad S'_{\delta_i} = S_1 S_{\delta_i} S_1^{-1}.$$

By Section 3.14, this mapping from the S_i to the S'_i is an automorphism of the free group generated by the S_i.

4.7 Coverings of complexes

There is a relation between complexes which is very similar to homomorphism of groups. We introduce it with the help of the following definitions.

A complex $\mathfrak{C}$ covers a complex $\mathfrak{C}^*$ if each point p and each segment s of $\mathfrak{C}$ is associated with a point $\boldsymbol{A}(p) = p^*$ and with a segment $\boldsymbol{A}(s) = s^*$, respectively, of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ in the following way:

A.1. Each p^* corresponds to at least one p.

A.2. If p is the initial point of s_i^{ε} then $\boldsymbol{A}(p)$ is the initial point of $\boldsymbol{A}(s_i^{\varepsilon})$.

A.3. If $s_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1}, s_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2}, \ldots, s_{\alpha_n}^{\varepsilon_n}$ are the segments with initial point p, then

$$\boldsymbol{A}(s_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1}), \quad \boldsymbol{A}(s_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2}), \quad \ldots, \quad \boldsymbol{A}(s_{\alpha_n}^{\varepsilon_n})$$

are all different, and in fact they are the segments with initial point $\boldsymbol{A}(p)$.

A.4. $\boldsymbol{A}(s^{-1}) = \boldsymbol{A}(s)^{-1}$.

$\boldsymbol{A}$ is called a mapping of $\mathfrak{C}$ onto $\mathfrak{C}^*$, or a covering of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ by $\mathfrak{C}$, or a homomorphism[6] from $\mathfrak{C}$ to $\mathfrak{C}^*$. $\mathfrak{C}$ is called homomorphic to $\mathfrak{C}^*$ if there is a homomorphism $\boldsymbol{A}$ with $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$.

If each element of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ corresponds to only a single element of $\mathfrak{C}$, then $\mathfrak{C}$ is said to be *isomorphic* to $\mathfrak{C}^*$. This relation is reflexive and symmetric. If

$$w = s_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} s_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots s_{\alpha_n}^{\varepsilon_n}$$

is a path, then the sequence of segments

$$\boldsymbol{A}(s_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1})\boldsymbol{A}(s_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2}) \cdots \boldsymbol{A}(s_{\alpha_n}^{\varepsilon_n})$$

is likewise a path, which may be denoted by $\boldsymbol{A}(w)$. If w is closed, then $\boldsymbol{A}(w)$ is also closed. Thus if $\boldsymbol{A}(w)$ is open, w is also open. If $\mathfrak{C}'$ is any subcomplex of $\mathfrak{C}$, then by $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}')$ we mean the corresponding points and segments of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ under the mapping $\boldsymbol{A}$. They likewise constitute a complex $\mathfrak{C}'^*$.

It follows from A.2 and A.4 that if p is the final point of $s_i^{\varepsilon_i}$ then $\boldsymbol{A}(p)$ is the final point of $\boldsymbol{A}(s_i^{\varepsilon_i})$.

A.3 can also be expressed as follows. The segments which have p as initial point are mapped one-to-one onto the segments which have $\boldsymbol{A}(p)$ as initial point. It should be stressed that s and s^{-1} are different segments. Thus it can happen, e.g., that p bounds two nonsingular segments and $\boldsymbol{A}(p)$ bounds one singular segment.

It follows from A.1 and A.3 that each segment s^* corresponds to at least one segment s for which $\boldsymbol{A}(s) = s^*$.

The homomorphism relation is transitive, or more precisely: if $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{C}^*, \mathfrak{C}^{**}$ are three complexes, the elements of which are denoted by

$$p, s, \quad p^*, s^*, \quad p^{**}, s^{**}$$

and if

$$\boldsymbol{A}_1(p) = p^*, \quad \boldsymbol{A}_1(s) = s^*$$

is a covering of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ by $\mathfrak{C}$, and

$$\boldsymbol{A}_2(p^*) = p^{**}, \quad \boldsymbol{A}_2(s^*) = s^{**}$$

is a covering of $\mathfrak{C}^{**}$ by $\mathfrak{C}^*$, and if we set

$$\boldsymbol{A}_3(p) = \boldsymbol{A}_2(\boldsymbol{A}_1(p)) = p^{**}, \quad \boldsymbol{A}_3(s) = \boldsymbol{A}_2(\boldsymbol{A}_1(s)) = s^{**},$$

then $\boldsymbol{A}_3$ is a covering of $\mathfrak{C}^{**}$ by $\mathfrak{C}$.

Namely, each p^{**} in $\mathfrak{C}^{**}$ corresponds to some p, because there is a p^* with $\boldsymbol{A}_2(p^*) = p^{**}$ and in turn a p with $\boldsymbol{A}_1(p) = p^*$. If p is the initial point of s^ε, then $\boldsymbol{A}_3(p)$ is the initial point of $\boldsymbol{A}_3(s^\varepsilon)$, because $\boldsymbol{A}_i(p)$ is the initial point of $\boldsymbol{A}_1(s^\varepsilon)$ and $\boldsymbol{A}_2(\boldsymbol{A}_1(p)) = \boldsymbol{A}_3(p)$ is the initial point of $\boldsymbol{A}_2(\boldsymbol{A}_1(s^\varepsilon)) = \boldsymbol{A}_3(s^\varepsilon)$. If $\boldsymbol{A}_3(p) = p^{**}$ then the segments beginning

[6] Reidemeister calls it an "isomorphism," using the old terminology which called all homomorphisms "isomorphisms," and distinguished our isomorphisms as "one-to-one isomorphisms." Of course, the old terminology is confusing for modern readers, so I have used the words "homomorphism" and "isomorphism" as we do today. (Translator's note.)

with p are mapped one-to-one onto those beginning with p^{**}, because $\boldsymbol{A}_1$ maps these segments one-to-one onto those beginning with $\boldsymbol{A}_1(p)$, and $\boldsymbol{A}_2$ maps the latter one-to-one onto those beginning with p^{**}. Finally,

$$\boldsymbol{A}_3(s^{-1}) = \boldsymbol{A}_2(\boldsymbol{A}_1(s^{-1})) = \boldsymbol{A}_2(\boldsymbol{A}_1(s)^{-1}) = (\boldsymbol{A}_3(s))^{-1}.$$

If $\mathfrak{C}$ is connected, then so too is the covered complex $\mathfrak{C}^*$, because if p_1^*, p_2^* are any two points of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ then there are two points p_1, p_2 with

$$\boldsymbol{A}(p_i) = p_i^* \quad (i = 1,2),$$

and there is a path w in $\mathfrak{C}$ from p_1 to p_2. But then $\boldsymbol{A}(w)$ is a path from p_1^* to p_2^*.

4.8 Paths and coverings

It also follows from A.3 that

If p_1 and p_1' are two points for which

$$\boldsymbol{A}(p_1) = \boldsymbol{A}(p_1')$$

and if w is a path which begins at p_1, then there is a well-defined path w' which begins at p_1' and for which

$$\boldsymbol{A}(w') = \boldsymbol{A}(w).$$

Namely, if s^ε is the initial segment of w then there is exactly one segment $s'^{\varepsilon'}$ beginning at p_1 for which $\boldsymbol{A}(s'^{\varepsilon'}) = \boldsymbol{A}(s^\varepsilon)$, and if p_2 is the final point of s, p_2' that of s', then $\boldsymbol{A}(p_2) = \boldsymbol{A}(p_2')$. The general theorem follows by induction. If a path w^* beginning at p^* is reduced, $\boldsymbol{A}(p) = p^*$ and if w is the path beginning at p with $\boldsymbol{A}(w) = w^*$, then by A.3 w is also reduced. If w^* is simple, then w is also simple, for w is certainly reduced and each proper subpath of w is open, because each proper subpath of w^* is open.

If $\mathfrak{B}^*$ is a tree contained in $\mathfrak{C}^*$, if p^* is a point of $\mathfrak{B}^*$, if the w_i^* are the simple paths in $\mathfrak{B}^*$ from p^* to the points p_i^*, and if also $\boldsymbol{A}(p) = p^*$ and the w_i are the paths emanating from p with $\boldsymbol{A}(w_i) = w_i^*$, then the segments traversed by the paths w_i form a complex $\mathfrak{B}$ which is likewise a tree. Namely, $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{B}) = \mathfrak{B}^*$ and this relation between the points and segments of $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B}^*$ is a bijection. Firstly, all of p, p_i are different, because all of p^*, p_i^* are different, so $\boldsymbol{A}(p_i) = p_i^*$ is one-to-one with respect to the points. Further, if s^* is a segment of $\mathfrak{B}^*$ which begins at p_a^*, suppose s_i $(i = 1,2)$ are two segments of $\mathfrak{B}$ for which

$$\boldsymbol{A}(s_1) = \boldsymbol{A}(s_2) = s^*.$$

Then s_1 and s_2 must begin at p_a, and hence by A.3 we certainly cannot have $\boldsymbol{A}(s_1) = \boldsymbol{A}(s_2)$. Thus in fact $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B}^*$ are isomorphic to each other and therefore $\mathfrak{B}$ is a tree.

If w^* is a simple closed path which begins and ends at p^*, w^{*k} is the same path traversed k times, and if

$$\boldsymbol{A}(w_k) = w^{*k},$$

then it may happen that the w_k for $k < a$ are open paths but w_a is a closed path. In this event w_a is a simple closed path.

Namely, if

$$w_a = w'_1 w'_2 w'_3 \cdots w'_a \quad \text{with} \quad A(w'_i) = w^* \quad (i = 1,2,\ldots,a)$$

then the w'_i are certainly simple paths. The initial points $p^{(i)}$ of the w'_i, and only they, lie over the same point p^* and by hypothesis they are all different from the first, $p^{(1)}$. But they are also all different from each other; for if $p^{(i)} = p^{(l)}$ for $i < l$ then $p^{(1)} = p^{(l-i+1)}$, because the path over w^{*-i+1} emanating from $p^{(i)}$ and the path over w^{*-i+1} emanating from $p^{(l)}$ are subpaths of w_a^{-1} which end at $p^{(1)}$ and $p^{(l-i)}$ respectively, and they are otherwise identical because $p^{(i)} = p^{(l)}$. Supposing further that w_a passes through the point p' twice, and in fact once in w'_i and the second time in w'_l, then the subpath of w'_i from p' to $p^{(i+1)}$ and the subpath of w'_l from p' to $p^{(l+1)}$ must lie over the same subpath $w^{*\prime}$ of w^*; for, since w^* is simple, w^* passes through the point $\boldsymbol{A}(p')$ only once, and $w^{*\prime}$ is determined thereby. Thus $p^{(i+1)} = p^{(l+1)}$, contrary to what was previously shown. Likewise one concludes: if all paths w_k emanating from p and lying over w^{*k} are open, then they are also simple.

4.9 Simplicity of a covering

With the help of the results on the trees $\mathfrak{B}$ in $\mathfrak{C}$ for which $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{B}) = \mathfrak{B}^*$ is also a tree one can easily obtain a deeper understanding of the way $\mathfrak{C}$ covers a complex $\mathfrak{C}^*$. First we show:

If $\mathfrak{C}^*$ is a tree, $\mathfrak{C}$ is connected, and $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$ is a covering, then $\mathfrak{C}$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{C}^*$. If $\mathfrak{C}$ is not connected, then $\mathfrak{C}$ separates into finitely or denumerably many trees $\mathfrak{B}_1, \mathfrak{B}_2, \ldots$ which are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{C}^*$.

For if p is any point with $\boldsymbol{A}(p) = p^*$ then, by Section 4.8, there is a tree $\mathfrak{B}_p$ which is a subcomplex of $\mathfrak{C}$, contains p, and for which $\boldsymbol{A}(p) = \mathfrak{B}_p$. Now if p' is any point of $\mathfrak{B}_p$ and s is any segment of $\mathfrak{C}$ which begins at p', then s belongs to $\mathfrak{B}_p$. For $\boldsymbol{A}(s) = s^*$ and $\boldsymbol{A}(p') = p^{*\prime}$ belong to $\mathfrak{C}^*$, so in $\mathfrak{B}_p$ there is a segment s' which begins at p' and for which $\boldsymbol{A}(s') = s^*$. But in $\mathfrak{C}$ there is only one segment which begins at p' and for which $\boldsymbol{A}(s') = s^*$. Thus $s = s'$. $\mathfrak{B}_p$ is therefore identical with $\mathfrak{C}$ in the case where $\mathfrak{C}$ is connected, and otherwise it is a component of $\mathfrak{C}$.

Now to the general case, where $\mathfrak{C}^*$ is connected but not a tree. In this case let $\mathfrak{B}^*$ be a subcomplex of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ which is a tree and contains all the points of $\mathfrak{C}^*$. If $\boldsymbol{A}(p) = p^*$ then by $\mathfrak{B}_p$ we mean the tree in $\mathfrak{C}$ containing p and for which $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{B}_p) = \mathfrak{B}^*$. We show:

If p and p' are two different points of $\mathfrak{C}$ for which $\boldsymbol{A}(p) = \boldsymbol{A}(p')$, then the trees associated with them, $\mathfrak{B}_p$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{p'}$, are disjoint.

Namely, suppose that $\mathfrak{B}_p$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{p'}$ had the point p'' in common. Then there would be a simple path w, lying wholly in $\mathfrak{B}_p$, running from p to p'', and a simple path w', lying wholly in $\mathfrak{B}_{p'}$, running from p' to p''. The paths w and w' are uniquely determined and $\boldsymbol{A}(w) = \boldsymbol{A}(w')$, because $\boldsymbol{A}(w)$ and $\boldsymbol{A}(w')$ run from $\boldsymbol{A}(p) = \boldsymbol{A}(p')$ to $\boldsymbol{A}(p'')$. Consequently, $\boldsymbol{A}(w^{-1}) = \boldsymbol{A}(w'^{-1})$ too, and since these two paths begin at the same point, $w^{-1} = w'^{-1}$ and $p = p'$, contrary to hypothesis. It follows further that:

If p is any point of $\mathfrak{C}$ and if $p^{(1)}, p^{(2)}, \ldots$ are all the points of $\mathfrak{C}$ for which $\boldsymbol{A}(p^{(i)}) = \boldsymbol{A}(p)$, and

$$\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(1)}}, \quad \mathfrak{B}_{p^{(2)}}, \quad \ldots$$

are the trees associated with the points $p^{(i)}$, then an arbitrary point of $\mathfrak{C}$ appears in exactly one of the trees $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$.

We need only show that each point p' of $\mathfrak{C}$ appears in a $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$. Let $\boldsymbol{A}(p') = p^{*\prime}$ and let $w^{*\prime}$ be the simple path in $\mathfrak{B}^*$ from p^* to $p^{*\prime}$, and w the uniquely determined path ending at p' for which $\boldsymbol{A}(w) = w^{*\prime}$. The latter begins at a point $p^{(i)}$ over p and runs wholly in $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$, thus p' belongs to $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$.

Thus if a point p^* lies under k different, or denumerably many, different points of $\mathfrak{C}$, then every point $p^{*\prime}$ lies under k or denumerably many different points of $\mathfrak{C}$. Likewise, each directed segment of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ lies under k or denumerably many segments of $\mathfrak{C}$. Correspondingly, the homomorphism $\boldsymbol{A}$ may be called *k-to-1* or *infinite-to-one*.

4.10 Coverings and permutations

The segments of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ are divided into two classes by the choice of tree $\mathfrak{B}^*$: the s^* that belong to the tree and the $\overline{s}^*$ that do not. Correspondingly, the segments of $\mathfrak{C}$ are also divided into two classes: the s that belong to a $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$, and the $\overline{s}$ that belong to no $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$.

Let $\overline{s}^*$ be any segment not belonging to $\mathfrak{B}^*$ and let

$$\overline{s}^{(1)}, \quad \overline{s}^{(2)}, \quad \ldots$$

be the segments of $\mathfrak{C}$ for which $\boldsymbol{A}(\overline{s}^{(i)}) = s^*$; let p_1^* and p_2^* be the initial and final points of $\overline{s}^*$, and let $p_1^{(i)}$ and $p_2^{(i)}$ be the initial and final points of $\overline{s}^{(i)}$. A $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$ then contains exactly one of the final points $p_2^{(n_i)}$ of these segments. The numbering may be arranged so that $\overline{s}^{(i)}$ begins in $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$ and thus ends in $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(n_i)}}$, and $p_1^{(i)}$ and $p_2^{(i)}$ lie in $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$. Then the correspondence

$$\pi = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \cdots \\ n_1 & n_2 & \cdots \end{pmatrix}$$

is a permutation. One such permutation corresponds to each segment $\overline{s}^*$. The initial and final points $p_1^{(i)}$ and $p_2^{(n_i)}$ of all $\overline{s}^{(i)}$ are determined by π and p_1^* and p_2^*.

Now we can immediately give the totality of k-to-one coverings of a complex $\mathfrak{C}^*$. We construct a tree $\mathfrak{B}^*$ and k trees isomorphic to $\mathfrak{B}^*$,

$$\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(1)}}, \quad \mathfrak{B}_{p^{(2)}}, \quad \ldots, \quad \mathfrak{B}_{p^{(k)}}.$$

Each segment $\overline{s}^*$ of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ which does not belong to $\mathfrak{B}^*$ is associated with k segments $\overline{s}^{(1)}, \overline{s}^{(2)}, \ldots, \overline{s}^{(k)}$ and an arbitrary permutation of the numbers $1, 2, \ldots, k$

$$\pi = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \cdots & k \\ n_1 & n_2 & \cdots & n_k \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $p_1^{(i)}, p_2^{(i)}$ are the points in $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$ over p_1^*, p_2^*, the initial and final points of $\overline{s}^*$, then $\overline{s}^{(i)}$ begins with $p_1^{(i)}$ and ends with $p_2^{(n_i)}$.

4.11 Fundamental domains

If we add to $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$ all segments $\overline{s}$ beginning at a point of $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$, without taking their final points, and call the domain constructed in this way $\mathfrak{F}_i$, then, for each point and segment of $\mathfrak{C}^*$, $\mathfrak{F}_i$ contains exactly one element for which

$$\boldsymbol{A}(p) = p^*, \quad \boldsymbol{A}(s) = s^*, \quad \boldsymbol{A}(\overline{s}) = \overline{s}^*.$$

For this reason, $\mathfrak{F}_i$ is called a *fundamental domain* of the covering $\boldsymbol{A}$. The $\mathfrak{F}_i$ are not complexes as long as there are segments connecting different $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$, because they do not contain final points of the latter or their equal but oppositely directed segments. For each segment $\overline{s}$ of $\mathfrak{F}_i$ there is a second, $\overline{s}'$, for which $\boldsymbol{A}(\overline{s}') = \boldsymbol{A}(\overline{s})^{-1}$. We can now omit one of each such pair, say the $\overline{s}'$, and take $\overline{s}^{-1}$ in place of it. The domain $\mathfrak{F}_i'$ resulting from $\mathfrak{F}_i$ in this way is again a fundamental domain.

If $\mathfrak{C}^*$ contains only a single point and $2r$ singular segments which begin and end at p^*, say $s_1^{*\pm 1}, s_2^{*\pm 1}, \ldots, s_r^{*\pm 1}$, then the trees $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$ also consist of single points $p^{(i)}$ lying over p^*, and $2r$ segments emanating from each point $p^{(i)}$ of $\mathfrak{C}$. $\mathfrak{C}$ is thus a regular complex of degree $2r$.

If one collects all segments of $\mathfrak{C}$ which lie over s_i^*, s_i^{*-1}, together with their boundary points, into a complex $\mathfrak{U}_i$, then the $\mathfrak{U}_i$ are again regular complexes of degree 2, which together contain all the points of $\mathfrak{C}$. Each segment of $\mathfrak{C}$ appears in exactly one $\mathfrak{U}_i$. We express this state of affairs as follows: $\mathfrak{C}$ may be *decomposed* into regular complexes $\mathfrak{U}_i$ of degree 2. One sees immediately that the converse also holds:

If $\mathfrak{C}$ is any regular complex of degree $2r$ and if $\mathfrak{U}_i$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, r)$ are subcomplexes of $\mathfrak{C}$ which constitute a decomposition in the above sense, then there is a mapping of $\mathfrak{C}$ onto a complex $\mathfrak{C}^*$ with a single point and r singular segments.

In order to define the mapping $\boldsymbol{A}(s) = s^*$, let s_k be any segment of $\mathfrak{C}$ which appears in $\mathfrak{U}_i$. $\mathfrak{U}_i$ need not be connected; let $\mathfrak{U}_{i,k}$ be the component of $\mathfrak{U}_i$ in which s_k appears. We can traverse all segments of $\mathfrak{U}_{i,k}$ in a closed path w and orientate the segments of $\mathfrak{U}_{i,k}$ in such a way that those occurring in w all have positive exponent. We then set $\boldsymbol{A}(s) = s_i^*$ for all segments s of $\mathfrak{U}_{i,k}$, and similarly for all $\mathfrak{U}_{i,k}$.

4.12 Regular complexes of even order

The following theorem[7] is interesting in this connection: *every regular complex of even degree $2r$ may be decomposed into r regular complexes $\mathfrak{U}_i$ of degree 2.* Consequently, every finite regular complex may be regarded as covering a complex $\mathfrak{C}^*$ with a single point and r singular segments.

For $2r = 2$ there is nothing to prove. For $2r = 4$ we argue as follows: let $\mathfrak{C}'$ be a component; then $\mathfrak{C}'$ is also a regular complex of degree 4 and hence it may be traversed by a tour w. If a_0 is the number of points of $\mathfrak{C}'$ then w contains $2a_0$ segments.

[7] JULIUS PETERSEN, Acta Math. **15**, (1891), 193–220.

With suitable orientation and numbering of the segments let

$$w = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_{2a_0}.$$

We now construct a complex $\mathfrak{U}_1$ from all the segments $s_{2l+1}^{\pm 1}$ and their boundary points, and a complex $\mathfrak{U}_2$ from the segments $s_{2l}^{\pm 1}$ and their boundary points. Each segment s of $\mathfrak{C}'$ appears in either $\mathfrak{U}_1$ or $\mathfrak{U}_2$. Since w traverses each point p of $\mathfrak{C}'$, p is itself the initial point of a segment $s_{2l+1}^{\pm 1}$ and the final point of a segment $s_{2l}^{\pm 1}$. Thus the complexes $\mathfrak{U}_1$ and $\mathfrak{U}_2$ each contain all the points of $\mathfrak{C}'$, and since w passes each point p exactly twice, each point p appears exactly twice in the series of initial and final points of the segments

$$s_1, \quad s_3, \quad \ldots, \quad s_{2a_0-1}.$$

That is, beginning at each point p there are exactly two segments from $\mathfrak{U}_1$ and two from $\mathfrak{U}_2$.

In order to settle the general case, we must still prove a few lemmas. First some definitions!

If $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{C}'$ are two regular complexes with a_0 points and degree $2r$, if there is a subcomplex $\mathfrak{C}_n$ of $\mathfrak{C}$ which contains $2l$ segments and is homomorphic to a subcomplex $\mathfrak{C}'_n$ of $\mathfrak{C}'$, and if there is no subcomplex of $\mathfrak{C}$ having more than $2l$ segments which is homomorphic to a subcomplex $\mathfrak{C}'$, then $2a_0 r - 2l$ is called the *distance* between $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{C}'$. Thus l is zero only when $\mathfrak{C}$ contains only regular segments and $\mathfrak{C}'$ only singular segments.

For isomorphic complexes the distance is zero and, conversely, if the distance is zero then the complexes are isomorphic.

If s_1 and s_2 are two different and not just just oppositely directed segments of $\mathfrak{C}$, if p_{i1} are the boundary points of s_1 and p_{i2} are the boundary points of s_2, and if the complex $\mathfrak{C}'$ results from $\mathfrak{C}$ by replacing the segments s_1 and s_2 by two other segments s'_1 and s'_2, where s'_1 is bounded by p_{11}, p_{12} and s'_2 by p_{21}, p_{22}, then $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{C}'$ are called *neighboring*. The distance between neighboring complexes is at most 4.

4.13 Modifications of regular complexes

We now assert the theorem:

If $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{C}'$ are any two regular complexes of a_0 points and degree $2r$ then there are two chains of complexes, also of this kind,

$$\mathfrak{C}_1, \mathfrak{C}_2, \ldots, \mathfrak{C}_k; \quad \mathfrak{C}'_1, \mathfrak{C}'_2, \ldots, \mathfrak{C}'_l,$$

such that $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}_1$, $\mathfrak{C}' = \mathfrak{C}'_1$, $\mathfrak{C}'_l$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{C}_k$, and $\mathfrak{C}_i, \mathfrak{C}_{i+1}$, likewise $\mathfrak{C}'_i, \mathfrak{C}'_{i+1}$, are neighbors.

To prove this we first consider two complexes $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{C}'$ which possess no homomorphic subcomplexes. $\mathfrak{C}'$ then consists purely of singular segments, so we can replace $\mathfrak{C}'$ by a neighboring complex $\mathfrak{C}''$ with two regular segments, whose distance from $\mathfrak{C}$ is therefore less.

Let the distance between $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{C}'$ be $2a_0r-2l>0$, and let $\mathfrak{C}_n$ and $\mathfrak{C}'_n$ respectively be the largest isomorphic subcomplexes of $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{C}'$.

If all points of $\mathfrak{C}_n$ have order $2r$ then $\mathfrak{C}_n$ consists of certain components of $\mathfrak{C}$, and likewise $\mathfrak{C}'_n$ consists of certain components of $\mathfrak{C}'$. Let $\mathfrak{C}=\mathfrak{C}_n+\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_n$ and $\mathfrak{C}'=\mathfrak{C}'_n+\overline{\mathfrak{C}}'_n$. Then we must have $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_n$ consisting purely of regular segments and $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}'_n$ consisting purely of singular segments, otherwise $\mathfrak{C}_n$ and $\mathfrak{C}'_n$ would not be the largest homomorphic subcomplexes. Then if one replaces $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}'_n$ by a neighboring complex $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}''_n$ containing two regular segments, and sets $\mathfrak{C}''=\mathfrak{C}'_n+\overline{\mathfrak{C}}''_n$, then the distance between $\mathfrak{C}''$ and $\mathfrak{C}$ is less than that between $\mathfrak{C}'$ and $\mathfrak{C}$.

Now let p_1 be any point of $\mathfrak{C}_n$ which has order less than $2r$ in $\mathfrak{C}_n$. Further, let s be a segment emanating from p_1 which belongs to $\mathfrak{C}$ but not to $\mathfrak{C}_n$, and which ends at p_2. Let $\boldsymbol{A}(p_1)=p'_1$ be the point of $\mathfrak{C}'_n$ that corresponds to p_1 under the homomorphism $\boldsymbol{A}$ from $\mathfrak{C}_n$ to $\mathfrak{C}'_n$. Then p_1 has the same order in $\mathfrak{C}'_n$ as p_1 has in $\mathfrak{C}_n$, and thus there is a segment s' in $\mathfrak{C}'$ which emanates from p'_1 and does not belong to $\mathfrak{C}'_n$.

1. Now if p_2 belongs to $\mathfrak{C}_n$ and if $p'_2=\boldsymbol{A}(p_2)$ then the segments emanating from p'_1 that do not belong to $\mathfrak{C}'_n$ certainly cannot end at p'_2, otherwise the subcomplex of $2l+2$ segments consisting of the elements of $\mathfrak{C}_n$ together with s would be homomorphic to the subcomplex consisting of the elements of $\mathfrak{C}'_n$ together with a segment s'. Thus s' ends at $p'_3\neq p'_2$. Likewise, p_2 has an order less than $2r$ in $\mathfrak{C}_n$, hence p'_2 does similarly, and so there is a segment s'' emanating from p'_2 which does not belong to $\mathfrak{C}'_n$ and ends at $p'_4\neq p'_1$.

We now construct a new complex $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}'$ from $\mathfrak{C}'$ by introducing a segment $\overline{s}'$ between p'_1 and p'_2 and a segment $\overline{s}''$ between p'_3 and p'_4. $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}'$ is again regular, and a neighbor of $\mathfrak{C}'$. The distance between $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}'$ and $\mathfrak{C}$ is smaller by at least 4.

2. If p_2 does not belong to $\mathfrak{C}_n$, then the segments emanating from p'_1 must all end in $\mathfrak{C}'$, otherwise we again could give a subcomplex of $\mathfrak{C}$, of $2l+4$ segments, homomorphic to a subcomplex of $\mathfrak{C}'$. $\mathfrak{C}'_n$ then satisfies the hypothesis that we made about $\mathfrak{C}_n$ in 1, and we construct a complex $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}$ neighboring $\mathfrak{C}$ by the same process, where $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}$ has a smaller distance from $\mathfrak{C}'$ than $\mathfrak{C}$. The assertion follows by iterated application of this process.

4.14 Invariance of the decomposition

The following theorem holds:

If $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{C}'$ are neighboring regular complexes of degree $2r>4$ and if $\mathfrak{C}$ may be decomposed into r regular complexes

$$\mathfrak{U}_1,\quad \mathfrak{U}_2,\quad \ldots,\quad \mathfrak{U}_r$$

of degree 2, then $\mathfrak{C}'$ may also be decomposed into r such complexes

$$\mathfrak{U}'_1,\quad \mathfrak{U}'_2,\quad \ldots,\quad \mathfrak{U}'_r.$$

When $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{C}'$ are isomorphic this is clear. In any case, $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{C}'$ contain a common subcomplex $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}$ of $2ra_0-4$ segments. Let $s_1,s_2;s_1^{-1},s_2^{-1}$ be the segments of $\mathfrak{C}$ that

do not belong to $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}$, and $s'_1, s'_2; s'^{-1}_1, s'^{-1}_2$ the segments of $\mathfrak{C}'$ that do not belong to $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}$. $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}$ contains all points of $\mathfrak{C}$, because $2r > 4$. Let $p_{k,i}$ $(k = 1,2)$ be the boundary points of s_i $(i = 1,2)$. Then, with suitable numbering, $p_{1,1}$ and $p_{1,2}$ bound the segment s'_1 and hence $p_{2,1}$ and $p_{2,2}$ bound the segment s'_2.

We now distinguish two cases:

1. The segments s_1 and s_2 may belong to the same subcomplex $\mathfrak{U}_1$ of $\mathfrak{C}$. Then all segments and points of the $\mathfrak{U}_i$ $(i \geq 2)$ belong to $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}$. We now define

$$\mathfrak{U}'_i = \mathfrak{U}_i \quad (i = 2, \ldots, r)$$

and let $\mathfrak{U}'_1$ be the complex that results from $\mathfrak{C}'$ by leaving out the $\mathfrak{U}'_i$. Then $\mathfrak{U}'_1$ is a regular complex of degree 2 which contains all points of $\mathfrak{C}'$, because the complex of all the elements of the $\mathfrak{U}'_i$ $(i \geq 2)$ is a regular complex of degree $2r-2$ containing all points of $\mathfrak{C}'$.

2. The segments s_1 and s_2 may belong to different subcomplexes $\mathfrak{U}_1$ and $\mathfrak{U}_2$. The all $\mathfrak{U}_i$ with $i \geq 3$ belong to $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}$ and we set $\mathfrak{U}'_i = \mathfrak{U}_i$ $(i \geq 3)$. Now the segments of $\mathfrak{C}'$ that belong to none of the $\mathfrak{U}_i$ $(i \geq 3)$ constitute a regular complex of degree 4, and by Section 4.12 this may be decomposed into two regular complexes $\mathfrak{U}'_1$ and $\mathfrak{U}'_2$ of degree 2. Then the

$$\mathfrak{U}'_i \quad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, r)$$

constitute a decomposition of $\mathfrak{C}'$ into r regular complexes of degree 2.

Since there are certainly regular complexes of degree $2r$ with a_0 points which may be decomposed into r complexes of degree 2, it follows with the help of Section 4.13 that all regular complexes of degree $2r$ may be decomposed into r complexes of degree 2.

4.15 Regular complexes of degree three

We now single out a special class of k-fold coverings of $\mathfrak{C}^*_2$, the complex of a single point with two singular segments: the permutation associated with the segment s^*_2 must leave no element fixed and must yield the identity when applied twice in succession. Then, if s_1 and s_2 are the two segments that emanate from $p^{(i)}$ and lie over s^*_2 and s^{*-1}_2 respectively, s_1 and s_2 must both end at the same point $p^{(l)}$. The $p^{(i)}$ may therefore be grouped in pairs, which necessarily have degree k. The numbering of points may be arranged so that the segments over s^*_2 lead from $p^{(i)}$ to $p^{(i+1)}$. We now construct a new complex $\mathfrak{C}_{2k}$ in which we replace each pair of segments over $s^{*\pm 1}_2$ with the same initial point $p^{(i)}$ and final point $p^{(i+1)}$ by a single segment s'_i. $\mathfrak{C}_{2k}$ contains k points and $3k$ segments. Three segments emanate from each point, so $\mathfrak{C}_{2k}$ is a regular complex of degree 3. If one collects all segments lying over s^*_1, s^{*-1}_1 into a complex $\mathfrak{U}_1$, and all the remaining segments of $\mathfrak{C}_{2k}$ into a complex $\mathfrak{U}_2$, then one sees that $\mathfrak{U}_1$ is a regular complex of degree 2, $\mathfrak{U}_2$ is a regular complex of degree 1, and the two complexes constitute a decomposition of $\mathfrak{C}_{2k}$. The corresponding covering complex $\mathfrak{C}^*_2$ may be easily recovered from $\mathfrak{C}_{2k}$ and the given decomposition.

It is now natural to ask whether all regular complexes of degree 3 may be decomposed into a regular complex of degree two and one of degree one. This is not the

case, as is shown by the example of the complex with points p_i $(i=0,1,2,3)$ and the regular segments s_i with the boundary points p_0, p_i as well the singular segments s_i' with the boundary points p_i $(i=1,2,3)$.

In general it may be proved that an indecomposable regular complex of degree 3 which contains no singular segment must have at least three "leaves." A leaf is a subcomplex connected to the remaining points of $\mathfrak{C}$ by just a single segment. Thus the example given has three leaves.[8]

Apart from this, little is known about the decomposition of regular complexes of odd order into subcomplexes. It may be pointed out that there is a regular complex of degree three, containing no singular segment, which may be decomposed into a complex of degree two and one of degree one, but not into three complexes of degree one.[9]

4.16 Coverings and permutation groups

We go further into the connection between the permutations Π and the coverings of a complex containing only one point. The Π generate a permutation group $\mathfrak{P}$ consisting of all the permutations representable as power products of the Π. Naturally, the structure of this group is closely connected with the structure of the covering.

Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a covering of the complex $\mathfrak{C}_r^*$ with one point p and r singular segments $s_1^*, s_2^*, \ldots, s_r^*$ and their inverses s_i^{*-1}. Let $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_r$ be free generators of a free group $\mathfrak{S}$. Now if

$$w = s_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} s_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots s_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m}$$

is any path in $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}(s_{\alpha_i}^{\varepsilon_i}) = s_{\beta_i}^{*\ \eta_i}$, then

$$\boldsymbol{A}(w) = s_{\beta_1}^{*\ \eta_1} s_{\beta_2}^{*\ \eta_2} \cdots s_{\beta_m}^{*\ \eta_m},$$

so let

$$W = S_{\beta_1}^{\eta_1} S_{\beta_2}^{\eta_2} \cdots S_{\beta_m}^{\eta_m}$$

be the power product from $\mathfrak{S}$ associated with w. Each power product of $\mathfrak{S}$ corresponds to a well-defined path w when an initial point is given in $\mathfrak{C}$. By a relation in the S we mean a power product $R(S)$ such that all the paths in $\mathfrak{C}$ corresponding to the $R(S)$ are closed. The collection $\mathfrak{R}$ of relations constitutes an invariant subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}$. For R^{-1} is also a relation along with R, and $R_1 R_2$ along with R_1, R_2; thus $\mathfrak{R}$ is a subgroup. And since

$$S_i^{\varepsilon_i} R S_i^{-\varepsilon_i} \quad (i=1,2,\ldots,r)$$

is also a relation along with R, $\mathfrak{R}$ is an invariant subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}$. We now assert that the factor group $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{S}/\mathfrak{R}$ is isomorphic to the permutation group $\mathfrak{P}$, when we understand $\Pi\Pi'$ to be the permutation resulting from first performing Π, then Π'. If Π_i $(i=1,2,\ldots,r)$ are the permutations associated with the segments s_i^*, then we claim more precisely that

$$\boldsymbol{I}(S_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} S_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots S_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m}) = \Pi_{\alpha_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \Pi_{\alpha_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots \Pi_{\alpha_m}^{\varepsilon_m}$$

[8] Cf. the work cited on p. 96.

[9] J. PETERSEN, L'intermed **5**, (1898), 225.

is an isomorphism between $\mathfrak{P}$ and $\mathfrak{F}$. The mapping is certainly a homomorphism between the free group $\mathfrak{S}$ and the group $\mathfrak{P}$. But now the elements of $\mathfrak{R}$ correspond to the identity permutation and, on the other hand, each power product corresponding to the identity permutation also belongs to $\mathfrak{R}$. This is because such power products correspond exactly to the closed paths. Thus the association follows.

4.17 Residue class group diagrams

Now we suppose that the complex $\mathfrak{C}$ is connected. Then the connection between $\mathfrak{F}$, $\mathfrak{P}$ and the structure of $\mathfrak{C}$ may be further elucidated. Let p_0 be an arbitrary, but fixed, point of $\mathfrak{C}$ and let G be a power product for which the path emanating from p_0 is closed. The collection $\mathfrak{G}$ of these power products G obviously constitute a group, a subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}$. For G^{-1} obviously belongs to $\mathfrak{G}$ along with G, and G_1G_2 along with G_1, G_2. Now if F_1 and F_2 are any two power products for which the paths emanating from p_0 lead to the same point p' of $\mathfrak{C}$, then F_1 and F_2 belong to the same right-sided residue class modulo $\mathfrak{G}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$. For $F_1F_2^{-1}$ belongs to $\mathfrak{G}$, and thus $F_1 = G_1F_2$. Conversely, if F_1 and F_2 are two power products which belong to the same right-sided residue class $\mathfrak{G}F$ in $\mathfrak{F}$, then

$$F_1 = G_1F, \quad F_2 = G_2F,$$

and since the paths emanating from p_0 that correspond to the G end at p_0, the paths emanating from p_0 that correspond to F_1 and F_2 end at the same point p' of $\mathfrak{C}$.

If $\mathfrak{C}$ is connected then, relative to a distinguished point p_0, each point of $\mathfrak{C}$ corresponds to a certain residue class $\mathfrak{G}F$ modulo $\mathfrak{G}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$, and for each such residue class there is a point. If the points p' and p'' are connected by a segment s', and if p' corresponds to the residue class $\mathfrak{G}F'$, p'' to the residue class $\mathfrak{G}F''$, and if s' lies over $\boldsymbol{A}(s') = s_i^{*\varepsilon}$ then,

$$\mathfrak{G}F'' = \mathfrak{G}F'S_i^{\varepsilon}.$$

It is therefore natural to view $\mathfrak{S}$ as the *residue class diagram* of $\mathfrak{G}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$.

Conversely, if $\mathfrak{F}$ is any group with finitely many generators $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_r$ and if $\mathfrak{G}$ is a subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}$, then a residue class group diagram $\mathfrak{C}$ of $\mathfrak{G}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$ with the generators S_i may always be constructed. Namely, let $\mathfrak{C}^*$ be the complex with one point and r singular segments $s_1^*, s_2^*, \ldots, s_r^*$. Each residue class $\mathfrak{G}F$ modulo $\mathfrak{G}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$ corresponds to a point p of $\mathfrak{C}$, p' corresponds to the residue class $\mathfrak{G}F'$ and p'' to the residue class $\mathfrak{G}F''$, and if

$$\mathfrak{G}F'' = \mathfrak{G}F'S_i$$

then p' and p'' may be connected by a segment s which begins at p' and ends at p'', and s covers the segment $\boldsymbol{A}(s) = s_i^*$. Apart from the segments given in this way, $\mathfrak{C}$ contains only their oppositely directed segments.[10]

Thus there are exactly $2r$ segments emanating from each point p of $\mathfrak{C}$, lying over s_i^* or s_i^{*-1}. Then if we let $\boldsymbol{A}(p) = p^*$ one sees that $\boldsymbol{A}$ is a covering of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ by $\mathfrak{C}$.

Instead of constructing the group $\mathfrak{F}$ first, one may also directly construct the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ of the free group $\mathfrak{S}$ whose elements correspond to closed paths beginning

[10] O. SCHREIER, Hamb. Abhdlg, **5** (1929), 180.

at p_0. Then to each point different from p_0 there corresponds a residue class $\mathfrak{U}S$ modulo $\mathfrak{U}$ in $\mathfrak{S}$. The group $\mathfrak{R}$ defined in Section 4.16 is the intersection of the subgroups conjugate to $\mathfrak{U}$ in $\mathfrak{S}$; the group $\mathfrak{U}$ contains the power products of the S_i that yield elements of $\mathfrak{G}$.

Conversely, for each subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ of $\mathfrak{S}$ there is a such a regular complex and a covering by it of the complex of a single point with r singular segments. *Since the paths emanating from a point p_0 always constitute a free group, one sees that all subgroups of a free group are free.* (Cf. Section 3.9.)[11]

If $\mathfrak{C}^*$ is any connected complex and $\mathfrak{C}$ is a connected covering of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ then the fundamental domains of this covering with respect to the complexes $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$ may be put in one-to-one correspondence with the residue classes $\mathfrak{G}F$ modulo a group $\mathfrak{G}$ in a group $\mathfrak{F}$. One obtains a residue class group diagram of $\mathfrak{G}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$ by contracting $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$ to a point $p^{(i)}$.

4.18 Regular Coverings

A particularly important class of coverings are the regular ones, defined as follows:

If w and w' are two paths of $\mathfrak{C}$ lying over the same path w^* of $\mathfrak{C}^*$, $\boldsymbol{A}(w) = \boldsymbol{A}(w')$, and if w' is always closed when w is, then the covering given by $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$ is regular.

The simplest regular covering is a one-to-one mapping $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$, where each p^* is thus associated with only one p, and hence each s^* with only one s.

If w is a simple open path then w' must also be a simple open path when $\boldsymbol{A}(w) = \boldsymbol{A}(w')$. For if w_1' is a closed subpath of w' then there is a well-defined subpath w_1 of w for which $\boldsymbol{A}(w_1) = \boldsymbol{A}(w_1')$. Then w_1 must also be closed, contrary ot the assumption that w is simple an open. One deduces that, if w is a simple closed path, then w' is also a simple closed path when $\boldsymbol{A}(w) = \boldsymbol{A}(w')$.

One might conjecture that the composition of regular coverings is transitive, i. e., the following state of affairs: if $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{C}', \mathfrak{C}''$ are three complexes, $\boldsymbol{A}_1(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}'$ is a regular mapping of $\mathfrak{C}$ onto $\mathfrak{C}'$, and $\boldsymbol{A}_2(\mathfrak{C}') = \mathfrak{C}''$ is a regular mapping of $\mathfrak{C}'$ onto $\mathfrak{C}''$, then the mapping of $\mathfrak{C}$ onto $\mathfrak{C}''$ given by

$$\boldsymbol{A}_2(\boldsymbol{A}_1(\mathfrak{C})) = \boldsymbol{A}_3(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}''$$

is likewise regular. However, this is not the case, as examples easily show.

Now let $\mathfrak{C}^*$ be the complex of one point and r singular segments s_i^*. If we construct the groups $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{G}$ as in Section 4.17 then we see that $\mathfrak{G}$ is the group consisting only of the identity element E of $\mathfrak{F}$. For if the power products G correspond to the closed paths emanating from p, then each G corresponds to a closed path in $\mathfrak{C}$, and G belongs to $\mathfrak{R}$.

If $\mathfrak{C}$ is connected then $\mathfrak{C}$ is called the *group diagram*[12] of $\mathfrak{F}$ in the generators S_i. Each group $\mathfrak{F}$ with a system of generators may be associated with a group diagram; one has only to replace the residue classes $\mathfrak{G}F$ in the method of Section 4.17 by $EF = F$, i. e., by the group elements themselves. *A group diagram is a regular covering of the associated complex $\mathfrak{C}^*$.*

[11] (Translator's note.)

[12] M. DEHN, Math. Ann., **69** (1910), 137.

4.19 Iterated Coverings and Groups

If $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{C}^*$ and $\mathfrak{C}^{**}$ are three connected complexes and $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{C}^*) = \mathfrak{C}^{**}$ are coverings of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ by $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{C}^{**}$ by $\mathfrak{C}^*$ respectively, and if $\boldsymbol{A}(p) = p^*$, $\boldsymbol{A}'(p^*) = p^{**}$, then the closed paths emanating from p^{**} constitute a group $\mathfrak{S}^{**}$. Let $\mathfrak{U}^*$ be the subgroup of paths w^{**} from among those corresponding to closed paths w^* emanating from p^*, in $\mathfrak{C}^*$, with $\boldsymbol{A}'(w^*) = w^{**}$, and let $\mathfrak{U}$ be the subgroup of the paths w^{**} corresponding to closed paths w in $\mathfrak{C}$ emanating from p with $\boldsymbol{A}'(\boldsymbol{A}(w)) = w^{**}$. Then $\mathfrak{U}$ is a subgroup of $\mathfrak{U}^*$, because if w is closed then $\boldsymbol{A}(w) = w^*$ is also closed.

If $L_1^*, L_2^*, \ldots, L_h^*$ is a system of representatives for the residue classes $\mathfrak{U}L^*$ modulo $\mathfrak{U}$ in $\mathfrak{U}^{**}$, and if $L_1^{**}, L_2^{**}, \ldots, L_h^{**}$ is a system of representatives for the residue classes $\mathfrak{U}^*L^{**}$ modulo $\mathfrak{U}^*$ in $\mathfrak{S}^{**}$, then the $L_i^* L_j^{**}$ $(i = 1,2,\ldots,h; k = 1,2,\ldots,l)$ constitute a complete system of representatives for the residue classes modulo $\mathfrak{U}$ in $\mathfrak{S}^{**}$. If p_{ik} are the points of $\mathfrak{C}$ for which $\boldsymbol{A}'(\boldsymbol{A}(p_{ik})) = p^{**}$, and if p_i^* are the points of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ for which $\boldsymbol{A}'(p_i^*) = p^{**}$ then, if the residue class $\mathfrak{U}L_i^* L_k^{**}$ corresponds to p_{ik} and if the residue class $\mathfrak{U}^* L_k^{**}$ corresponds to p_k^*, we have $\boldsymbol{A}(p_{ik}) = p_k^*$. From this it follows, conversely, that: *given two coverings $\boldsymbol{A}''(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^{**}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{C}^*) = \mathfrak{C}^{**}$, where $\boldsymbol{A}''$ corresponds to a subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ of $\mathfrak{S}^{**}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}'$ corresponds to a subgroup $\mathfrak{U}^*$ of $\mathfrak{S}^{**}$ and $\mathfrak{U}$ is a subgroup of $\mathfrak{U}^*$, then there is a further covering $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$ such that $\boldsymbol{A}'(\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C})) = \boldsymbol{A}''(\mathfrak{C})$.*

If $\mathfrak{C}^{**}$ is a complex of one point and r singular segments s_i^{**} $(i = 1,2,\ldots,r)$, $\mathfrak{C}^*$ is a residue class group diagram of the group $\mathfrak{G}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$ with the generators S_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,r)$, if $\mathfrak{C}$ is the group diagram of $\mathfrak{F}$ in the generators S_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,r)$, and if $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{C}^*) = \mathfrak{C}^{**}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}''(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^{**}$ are the corresponding coverings, then there is also a covering $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$. Because if the covering $\boldsymbol{A}''(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^{**}$ belongs to the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ of the fundamental group $\mathfrak{S}^{**}$ of $\mathfrak{C}^{**}$, and the covering $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{C}^*) = \mathfrak{C}^{**}$ belongs to the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}^*$ of the fundamental group $\mathfrak{S}^{**}$ then $\mathfrak{U}$ consists exactly of the representations of the identity of the group $\mathfrak{F}$ in the generators S_i, and hence the $\boldsymbol{A}'(w^*) = w^{**}$ for which $[w^{**}]$ belongs to $\mathfrak{U}$ must be in the residue class group diagram of a subgroup $\mathfrak{G}$ of $\mathfrak{G}$ of $\mathfrak{F}$, as well as in $\mathfrak{C}^*$. Analogous results hold for any connected complex $\mathfrak{C}^{**}$.

We obtain a special covering when we apply the covering construction to the subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}^*$ consisting of the identity element alone. The complex $\mathfrak{C}$ obtained in this way is called the *universal covering complex* of $\mathfrak{C}^*$. if $\mathfrak{C}'$ is a connected complex and $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}') = \mathfrak{C}^*$ is a covering of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ by $\mathfrak{C}'$ then, by the theorem proved above, there is also a covering $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}'$ of $\mathfrak{C}'$ by the universal covering complex $\mathfrak{C}$ of $\mathfrak{C}^*$.

The universal covering complex $\mathfrak{C}$ is a tree. Namely, let w be a closed reduced nonempty path in $\mathfrak{C}$. Then $\boldsymbol{A}(w) = w^*$ is a closed path in $\mathfrak{C}^*$ and $[w^*]$ is the identity element of the fundamental group $\mathfrak{S}^*$ of $\mathfrak{C}^*$, so $[w^*]$ is not reduced and likewise w is not reduced.

If $\mathfrak{C}^*$ is a complex of one point and r singular segments then the universal covering complex can be viewed as the group diagram of the free group with generators S_i $(i = 1,2,\ldots,r)$. This group diagram is therefore a tree.

4.20 Transformations into Itself

If $\mathfrak{C}$ is a multiple regular covering of $\mathfrak{C}^*$, then $\mathfrak{C}$ admits a group of mappings onto itself of the following kind: under the mapping, corresponding elements always remain over the same element of $\mathfrak{C}^*$. If $p^{(i)}$ and $p^{(k)}$ are two points over p^* then there is one and, when $\mathfrak{C}$ is connected, only one transformation which carries $p^{(i)}$ to $p^{(k)}$. The transformations constitute a group which is homomorphic to the group $\mathfrak{F}$, respectively $\mathfrak{P}$, and in fact it is isomorphic when $\mathfrak{C}$ is connected. From now on we assume that $\mathfrak{C}$ is connected.

If $\mathfrak{C}$ is a group diagram we define our transformations as follows: if p_F is the point corresponding to the group element F of $\mathfrak{F}$ and F' is an arbitrary element of $\mathfrak{F}$ then the transformation $\boldsymbol{I}_{F'}$ of the complex $\mathfrak{C}$ corresponding to F' sends the point p_F to $p_{FF'}$, and the segments s over s_i^* emanating from p_F go to the segments s' over s_i^* emanating from $p_{FF''}$. The final point p_{FS_i} of s in fact goes to the final point $p_{F'FS_i}$ of s'; $\boldsymbol{I}_{F'}$ is therefore an automorphism of $\mathfrak{C}$. There is exactly one $\boldsymbol{I}_{F'}$ which carries p_{F_1} to p_{F_2}.

The $\boldsymbol{I}_F$ constitute a group isomorphic to $\mathfrak{F}$, because

$$\boldsymbol{I}_{F''}(\boldsymbol{I}_{F'}(\mathfrak{C})) = \boldsymbol{I}_{F''F'}(\mathfrak{C}).$$

Finally, if $\boldsymbol{I}$ is any automorphism of $\mathfrak{C}$ which exchanges elements over the same element of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ and which carries p_F to $p_{F'F}$ then $\boldsymbol{I}_{F'^{-1}}(\boldsymbol{I}(\mathfrak{C}))$ is a mapping which leaves the point p_F fixed, and hence also the segments emanating from p_F, and their final points, and so on. Thus $\boldsymbol{I}_{F'^{-1}}(\boldsymbol{I}(\mathfrak{C}))$ is the identity map.

If $\mathfrak{C}$ is a connected covering of an arbitrary complex $\mathfrak{C}^*$, then the subcomplexes $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$ may be associated with the group elements F_i of $\mathfrak{F}$. If

$$FF_i = F_{k_i}$$

then F corresponds to the automorphism $\boldsymbol{I}_F$ sending $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$ to $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(k_i)}}$. $\boldsymbol{I}_F$ is uniquely and consistently determined by this, as one easily establishes using Section 4.17. One derives the properties of the group of the $\boldsymbol{I}_F$ analogously as with group diagrams.

The converse also holds: if $\mathfrak{C}$ is a connected complex and $\mathfrak{I}'$ is a group of automorphisms $\boldsymbol{I}$ of $\mathfrak{C}$, and if a transformation from $\mathfrak{I}'$ which leaves a point p of $\mathfrak{C}$ fixed is the identity mapping, then there is a connected complex $\mathfrak{C}^*$ and a regular covering $\boldsymbol{A}$ such that $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$. The transformation group $\mathfrak{I}$ associated with the covering is identical with $\mathfrak{I}'$.[13]

For example, if $\mathfrak{C}$ is the group diagram of a group $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{V}$ is a subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}$, then one can construct a complex $\mathfrak{C}'$ and a regular covering $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}'$ for which $\mathfrak{V}$ is the transformation group. If $\mathfrak{C}^*$ is the complex with a single point and singular segments corresponding to the generators of $\mathfrak{F}$, and if $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$ is the covering brought about by these generators, then there is also a covering $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{C}') = \mathfrak{C}^*$, and in fact $\boldsymbol{A}'$ is regular or not according as $\mathfrak{V}$ is an invariant subgroup of $\mathfrak{F}$ or not.

[13] With these observations, Reidemeister has come close to stating explicitly the 1977 theorem of Bass and Serre that a group acting freely on a tree is free. (Translator's note.)

One can also elucidate the process for determining generators and defining relations of subgroups by means of group diagrams. Retaining the notation of the last section, let $\mathfrak{B}'_{p'}$ be a spanning tree of $\mathfrak{C}'$, and let $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$ be the subcomplex of $\mathfrak{C}'$ for which $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}) = \mathfrak{B}'_{p'}$. Then corresponding to the simple paths w'_k in $\mathfrak{B}'_{p'}$ emanating from p', respectively the paths $w_k^{(i)}$ in $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$ emanating from $p^{(i)}$, we have power products L_k in the generators of $\mathfrak{F}$ which yield a complete system of representatives for the residue classes $\mathfrak{V}L$ and which satisfy the condition (Σ) of Section 3.5. One obtains from $\mathfrak{C}$ a group diagram $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ of $\mathfrak{V}$ by shrinking the segments of each $\mathfrak{B}_{p^{(i)}}$ to the point $p^{(i)}$.

From this one sees again that *subgroups of free groups are free* (cf. Section 3.9). Because, when $\mathfrak{F}$ is a free group on free generators, then $\mathfrak{C}$ is a tree; hence $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is also a tree.

Chapter 5

Surface Complexes

5.1 The Concept of a Surface Complex

By a surface complex[1] $\mathfrak{F}$ we mean a finite or denumerable collection of points, line segments and surface pieces satisfying the following conditions.

A.1. *The points and line segments of $\mathfrak{F}$ form a line segment complex $\mathfrak{C}$.*

A.2. *If f is a surface piece of $\mathfrak{F}$ then there is a closed path w of $\mathfrak{C}$ which circumscribes f once in the positive sense. If w' is a second path which circumscribes f once in the positive sense then w' is convertible to w by a cyclic interchange.*

A.3. *If w circumscribes the surface piece f positively, then w^{-1} circumscribes f negatively. For each surface piece f there is an oppositely directed f^{-1}. The surface piece $(f^{-1})^{-1}$ equals f, and w^{-1} circumscribes f^{-1} positively.*

The complex consisting of the elements of w is called the boundary of f. An element of the boundary bounds f. The surface piece f is called singular if its boundary path is not simple.

We are mainly concerned with special surface complexes called two-dimensional manifolds $\mathfrak{M}$. These satisfy four further axioms, of which we initially give only the first three.

A.4. *The line segment complex $\mathfrak{C}$ is connected.*

A.5. *If s is a segment of $\mathfrak{C}$, then s appears in the boundary of some surface piece f.*

A.6. *A boundary path w runs through a segment s at most twice. If the boundary path w of a surface piece f runs through the segment s only once then there is exactly one surface piece $f' \neq f^{\pm 1}$, the boundary of which, w', runs through s, and then only once. If w runs through the segment s twice, then s bounds only the surface piece f and the oppositely oriented f^{-1}.*

If s is a segment which belongs to the boundary of f then there is a boundary path of f which begins with s. We denote it by sw, with the understanding that

[1] Usually known today as a 2-complex. Likewise, what Reidemeister calls a "surface piece" would usually be called a 2-cell today. However, since Reidemeister does not intend to discuss the general case of an n-complex, it is more faithful to his mindset to use the "point", "line segment" and "surface" terminology. (Translator's note.)

w may be empty. If s occurs twice in a boundary path sw of f, then the latter is denoted by

$$sw = sw_1 s^{\varepsilon} w_2 \qquad (\varepsilon = \pm 1),$$

where the w_i may again be empty. There is then a second boundary path of f that begins with s, namely

$$sw' = sw_2 sw_1 \quad \text{when} \quad \varepsilon = +1,$$
$$sw' = sw_1^{-1} s^{-1} w_2^{-1} \quad \text{when} \quad \varepsilon = -1.$$

If s occurs only once in the boundary path of f, then there is a second surface piece f' with a boundary path of the form sw'. In any case, we can speak of the two boundary paths sw and sw' of $\mathfrak{M}$ which begin with s. We call the two segments s_α, s_β neighbors of s when s_α follows s in sw and s_β follows s in sw'.

The segments s_α and s_β both begin at the point where s ends. If s_α is a neighbor of s, then s^{-1} is a neighbor of s_α^{-1}. If s_α is a neighbor of s and s_β is a neighbor of s and $s_\alpha \neq s_\beta$, then s_α, s_β are the two neighbors of s. If s is a neighbor of s^{-1}, then there is a boundary path $ss^{-1}w$, and consequently the second boundary path beginning with s is $ss^{-1}w^{-1}$. Then both segments neighboring s are equal to s^{-1}.

5.2 Stars

The segments emanating from a point,

$$s_{\alpha_1}, \quad s_{\alpha_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad s_{\alpha_m}, \tag{1}$$

are said to form a *star* when their ordering is such that $s_{\alpha_{i-1}}$ and $s_{\alpha_{i+1}}$ are the neighbors of $s_{\alpha_i}^{-1}$. The segments (1) form a *closed star* when

$$s_{\alpha_m}, \quad s_{\alpha_1}, \quad s_{\alpha_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad s_{\alpha_m}, \quad s_{\alpha_1}$$

is a star. Thus a closed star can consist of a single segment. The sequence

$$s_{\alpha_i}, \quad s_{\alpha_{i+1}}, \quad \ldots, \quad s_{\alpha_{i+l}}, \tag{2}$$

is also a star when (1) is and $l \geq 1$; (2) is called a substar of (1). A star in which each segment appears only once is called *simple*.

If p is a point from which only finitely many segments emanate, then there is a simple closed star composed of those segments.

Namely, if

$$s_{\alpha_1}, \quad s_{\alpha_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad s_{\alpha_m}$$

is a star then we can certainly extend it by a further segment $s_{\alpha_{m+1}}$. Since s_{α_m} is a neighbor of $s_{\alpha_{m-1}}^{-1}$, $s_{\alpha_{m-1}}$ is a neighbor of $s_{\alpha_m}^{-1}$; now let $s_{\alpha_{m+1}}$ be the second segment neighboring $s_{\alpha_m}^{-1}$.

Thus there is certainly a star in which a segment s_1 beginning at p appears twice, and hence also a star

$$s_{\alpha_1}, \quad s_{\alpha_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad s_{\alpha_n}, \quad s_{\alpha_{n+1}}$$

in which $s_{\alpha_1} = s_{\alpha_{n+1}}$ and all the remaining s_{α_i} are different from each other and from s_{α_1}. Now, either $n = 1$, so that $s_{\alpha_1} = s_{\alpha_2}$ and both the segments neighboring $s_{\alpha_1}^{-1}$ are s_{α_1} itself, so s_{α_1} alone is a closed star; or else $n > 1$, in which case

$$s_{\alpha_1}, \quad s_{\alpha_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad s_{\alpha_n}$$

is a closed star, because

$$s_{\alpha_n}, \quad s_{\alpha_1}, \quad s_{\alpha_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad s_{\alpha_n}, \quad s_{\alpha_1}$$

is a star because s_{α_1} is a neighbor of s_{α_2} and to s_{α_n}, and s_{α_2} is different from s_{α_n}.

A proper substar of a simple star (1) is not closed, otherwise $s_{\alpha_i}, s_{\alpha_{i+1}}, \ldots, s_{\alpha_{i+l}}$ would be a closed substar of (1) and this would mean $s_{\alpha_{i-1}} = s_{\alpha_{i+l}}$ when $i > 1$, $s_{\alpha_i} = s_{\alpha_{i+l+1}}$ when $i = 1$.

Moreover, one sees that two stars consisting of segments beginning at p, which coincide in their first and last elements and contain the same elements, are identical.

Given two stars with the same number of elements, say m, such that the first and second terms of the first coincide with the last and second last, respectively, of the second, the kth term of the first is identical with the $(m-k)$th term of the second. It then follows:

If a segment s appears in a simple closed star (1) *consisting of segments which begin at p, then all simple closed stars of this kind result from* (1) *or from*

$$s_{\alpha_m}, \quad s_{\alpha_{m-1}}, \quad ,\ldots, \quad s_{\alpha_2}, \quad s_{\alpha_1}$$

by cyclic interchanges, and all closed stars result from a k-fold repetition of a simple closed star. On the other hand, each segment appears in some closed star.

5.3 Manifolds

Our last axiom for manifolds can now be stated:

A.7. *If s_1 and s_2 are two segments which begin at p then there is a star of segments beginning at p,*

$$s_{\alpha_1}, \quad s_{\alpha_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad s_{\alpha_m},$$

with $s_{\alpha_1} = s_1$ and $s_{\alpha_m} = s_2$.

It follows from this and the theorems of the previous section that there is no closed star around p which does not contain all the segments beginning at p.

If only finitely many segments begin at p then there is a simple closed star of all these segments. Then we can say that the segments beginning at p are cyclically ordered in a certain way. If infinitely many segments begin at p then all stars of these segments are open and consequently simple. The segments are "linearly" ordered.

A few more conclusions about the boundary paths of surface pieces may be drawn from axiom A.7: if there is a boundary path w which is not reduced, and hence equals $w_1 s s^{-1} w_2$, and if p is the final point of s, then only a single segment emanates from p, for s^{-1} constitutes a closed star. It follows, further, that such a

segment s cannot be singular. Otherwise the segments s and s^{-1} would emanate from the final point p of s, and s and s^{-1} together would constitute a closed star. Similarly, one sees that a subpath

$$s\,k_1 k_2 \cdots k_r s^{-1} \quad \text{where} \quad k_i = s_{i1} s_{i2} s_{i1}^{-1} s_{i2}^{-1}$$

and the s, s_{ik} are singular segments with boundary point p cannot appear in a boundary path. For

$$s, v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_r \quad \text{with} \quad v_i = s_{i1}^{-1}, s_{i2}, s_{i1}, s_{i2}^{-1}$$

constitutes a star, and in fact a simple closed star, which does not contain the segment s^{-1} emanating from p.

If $\mathfrak{M}$ is a manifold and if the boundary paths of the surface pieces $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_k$ are simple paths which together include each point at most once, then the manifold that results from $\mathfrak{M}$ by leaving out the surface pieces $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_k$ may be called a *manifold with boundary.*

Examples of manifolds are the canonical normal forms given in Section 5.11, polyhedra in Euclidean space, RIEMANN surfaces, or the subdivided surfaces described in the introduction.

5.4 An Auxiliary Manifold

The most important consequence of axiom A.7 in Section 5.3 is the existence of the dual manifold $\mathfrak{D}$ *for each manifold* $\mathfrak{M}$ *in which only finitely many segments emanate from each point* p.

We first derive an auxiliary manifold $\mathfrak{M}''$ from $\mathfrak{M}$ in the following way:

Each point p of $\mathfrak{M}$ corresponds to a certain point $\Delta_1(p) = p''$ of $\mathfrak{M}''$. Each segment s of $\mathfrak{M}$ also corresponds to a point $\Delta_1(s) = q''$ of $\mathfrak{M}''$ and in fact

$$\Delta_1(s) = \Delta_1(s^{-1}).$$

Finally, each surface piece f of $\mathfrak{M}$ corresponds to a point $\Delta_1(f) = r''$ of $\mathfrak{M}''$, and we have

$$\Delta_1(f) = \Delta_1(f^{-1}).$$

Conversely, under this correspondence each point of $\mathfrak{M}''$ is associated with either a point, a segment pair $s^{\pm 1}$, or a surface piece pair $f^{\pm 1}$ of $\mathfrak{M}$.

Further, each segment s corresponds to a path of two segments in $\mathfrak{M}''$,

$$\Delta_2(s) = s_1'' s_2''.$$

If p_1, p_2 are the initial and final points of s, then $\Delta_1(p_1)$ is the initial point of s_1'', $\Delta_1(p_2)$ is the final point of s_2'', and $\Delta_1(s)$ is the final point of s_1'' and the initial point of s_2''. In addition,

$$\Delta_2(s^{-1}) = (\Delta_2(s))^{-1} = s_2''^{-1} s_1''^{-1}.$$

Moreover, two segments t_1'', t_2'' emanate from each point $\Delta_1(s)$, ending at those points $\Delta_1(f_1)$ and $\Delta_1(f_2)$ corresponding to the regions f_1 and f_2 bounded by s. Each segment of $\mathfrak{M}''$ begins or ends at a point $\Delta_1(s)$. The points $\Delta_1(s)$ are of order four, the points $\Delta_1(f)$ are of order k when a simple boundary path of f has k elements.

Finally we come to the surface pieces of $\mathfrak{M}''$. These are all quadrilaterals, and each k-gon of $\mathfrak{M}$ corresponds to exactly k quadrilaterals in $\mathfrak{M}''$. If

$$w = s_{\alpha_1} s_{\alpha_2} \cdots s_{\alpha_k}$$

is a simple boundary path of f, let

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_2(w) &= \Delta_2(s_{\alpha_1})\Delta_2(s_{\alpha_2})\cdots\Delta_2(s_{\alpha_k}) \\ &= \left(s''^{(1)}_{\alpha_1} s''^{(2)}_{\alpha_1}\right)\left(s''^{(1)}_{\alpha_2} s''^{(2)}_{\alpha_2}\right)\cdots\left(s''^{(1)}_{\alpha_k} s''^{(2)}_{\alpha_k}\right)\end{aligned}$$

and let $t''_{\alpha_1}, t''_{\alpha_2}, \ldots, t''_{\alpha_k}$ respectively be the segments that lead from $\Delta_1(f)$ to the $\Delta_1(s_{\alpha_i})$. Then there are exactly k quadrilaterals $f''_{\alpha_1}, f''_{\alpha_2}, \ldots, f''_{\alpha_k}$ and in fact let

$$\begin{gathered} t''_{\alpha_1} s''^{(2)}_{\alpha_1} s''^{(1)}_{\alpha_2} t''^{-1}_{\alpha_2} \text{ be a boundary path of } f''_{\alpha_1}, \\ t''_{\alpha_i} s''^{(2)}_{\alpha_i} s''^{(1)}_{\alpha_{i+1}} t''^{-1}_{\alpha_{i+1}} \text{ be a boundary path of } f''_{\alpha_i}, \end{gathered}$$

and finally let

$$t''_{\alpha_k} s''^{(2)}_{\alpha_k} s''^{(1)}_{\alpha_1} t''^{-1}_{\alpha_1} \text{ be a boundary path of } f''_{\alpha_k}.$$

The surface complex $\mathfrak{M}''$ so described is a manifold. For the one-dimensional complex contained in it is connected, because any points $\Delta_1(f)$ and $\Delta_1(s)$ are connected to points $\Delta_1(p)$, and each point $\Delta_1(p)$ is connected to all the others of the same kind. Each segment of a path $\Delta_2(s)$ is run through at most once in a boundary path, and each such segment bounds two different surface pieces. The same holds for the segments t'' bounded by a point $\Delta_1(f)$ corresponding to a k-gon f $(k > 1)$. A segment t'' bounded by a $\Delta_1(f)$ corresponding to 1-gon is run through twice by the boundary path of the single surface piece in $\mathfrak{M}''$ corresponding to f. Finally, axiom A.7 is also satisfied by the three kinds of points $\Delta_1(p), \Delta_1(s), \Delta_1(f)$.

5.5 Dual Manifolds

For each point p of $\mathfrak{M}$ we now collect together all the surface pieces f'' of $\mathfrak{M}''$, together with the segments and points of their boundaries, into a surface complex $\mathfrak{P}$ whose boundary contains the point $p'' = \Delta_1(p)$. Each segment emanating from $\Delta_1(p)$ appears in the boundary of exactly two surface pieces of $\mathfrak{P}$. Let

$$f''_{\beta_1}, \quad f''_{\beta_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad f''_{\beta_m}$$

be all the distinct surface pieces of $\mathfrak{P}$, ordered in such a way that f''_{β_i} and $f''_{\beta_{i+1}}$, f''_{β_m} and f''_{β_1}, have exactly one boundary segment in common if $m > 1$, and oriented in such a way that the common boundary segment of f''_{β_i} and $f''_{\beta_{i+1}}$ is traversed in the

opposite directions for positive orientations of f''_{β_i} and $f''_{\beta_{i+1}}$. Now let $t''^{(1)}_{\beta_i} t''^{(2)}_{\beta_i}$ be the piece of the boundary path of f''_{β_i} from a segment t. Then $t''^{(1)}_{\beta_i}$ begins at a $\Delta_1(s)$ while $t''^{(2)}_{\beta_i}$ ends at such a point; $t''^{(1)}_{\beta_i}$ ends, and $t''^{(2)}_{\beta_i}$ begins, at a $\Delta_1(f)$. The path

$$w = t''^{(2)}_{\beta_1} t''^{(1)}_{\beta_2} t''^{(2)}_{\beta_2} t''^{(1)}_{\beta_3} \cdots t''^{(2)}_{\beta_m} t''^{(1)}_{\beta_1} \tag{1}$$

is a closed path we will call the boundary path of $\mathfrak{P}$.

We now construct the complex $\mathfrak{D}$ *dual to* $\mathfrak{M}$ by associating with each path $t^{(2)}t^{(1)}$ a segment $\Delta(t^{(2)}t^{(1)}) = t'$ of $\mathfrak{D}$, with each complex $\mathfrak{P}$ a pair of surface pieces $\Delta'(\mathfrak{P}) = f'^{\pm 1}$ of $\mathfrak{D}$, and with each point $\Delta_1(f)$ of $\mathfrak{M}''$ a unique point $\Delta'(\Delta_1(f)) = p'$ of $\mathfrak{D}$. If $t^{(2)}t^{(1)}$ begins and ends at p''_1 and p''_2 respectively then $\Delta'(t^{(2)}t^{(1)})$ begins and ends at $\Delta'(p''_1)$ and $\Delta'(p''_2)$ respectively. Let

$$\Delta'((t^{(2)}t^{(1)})^{-1}) = (\Delta'(t^{(2)}t^{(1)}))^{-1},$$

and if (1) is the boundary path of $\mathfrak{P}$ let

$$\Delta'(w) = \Delta'(t''^{(2)}_{\beta_1} t''^{(1)}_{\beta_2}) \cdots \Delta'(t''^{(2)}_{\beta_m} t''^{(1)}_{\beta_1})$$

be a boundary path of $\mathfrak{P}$.

One easily sees that: *the dual complex* $\mathfrak{D}$ *is a manifold.* For the segments s' are traversed by the boundary paths in the way required by A.6, and the stars of the s' come directly from the stars of the segments t'' around the points $\Delta_1(f)$ of $\mathfrak{M}''$.

The structure of $\mathfrak{D}$ may be described as follows: each point p of $\mathfrak{M}$ corresponds to a unique complex $\mathfrak{P}$ and hence also to the surface piece pair $\Delta(p) = f'^{\pm 1}$ of $\mathfrak{D}$; each surface piece of $\mathfrak{M}$ corresponds to exactly one point $\Delta(f) = p$ of $\mathfrak{D}$ and

$$\Delta(f^{-1}) = \Delta(f).$$

Each segment s of $\mathfrak{M}$ corresponds firstly to a point $\Delta_1(s)$, and through this point goes a path $t^{(1)}t^{(2)}$ and its inverse. The resulting correspondence between the segment pairs $s^{\pm 1}$ and the segment pairs $\Delta(s^{\pm 1}) = s'^{\pm 1}$ is likewise one-to-one. Further, the boundary relations change as follows. If p bounds the segment s or s^{-1}, then $\Delta(p)$ is bounded by the segments $\Delta(s^{\pm 1})$. If $s^{\pm 1}$ bounds a surface piece f, then one of the segments $s'^{\pm 1}$ is bounded by $\Delta(f)$, where $s'^{\pm 1} = \Delta(s^{\pm 1})$.

5.6 Dual Line Segment Complexes

As a result of the second relation one can construct the line segment complex $\mathfrak{D}_1$ of $\mathfrak{D}$ directly from $\mathfrak{M}$. If we imagine the segment pairs of $\mathfrak{D}$ numbered, and the segments of a pair denoted by s'_i, s'^{-1}_i, then it follows from the first condition that the boundary path of $\Delta(p)$ is also determined, provided this boundary path is a simple path and the segments traversed by a boundary path can be combined into a path in only one way. One can improve the statement of the structural relation between $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{D}$ by remarking that if

$$s_{\alpha_1}, \quad s_{\alpha_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad s_{\alpha_m}$$

is a simple closed star around p then there is a simple boundary path around $\Delta(p)$,

$$s'^{\,\varepsilon_1}_{\alpha_1} s'^{\,\varepsilon_2}_{\alpha_2} \cdots s'^{\,\varepsilon_m}_{\alpha_m} \qquad (\varepsilon_1 = \pm 1)$$

such that

$$\Delta(s^{\pm 1}_{\alpha_i}) = s'^{\,\pm 1}_{\alpha_i}.$$

In this way the boundary paths of surface pieces of $\mathfrak{D}$ are determined when no segment of $\mathfrak{D}$ is singular. Namely, ε_i is determined by the condition that (1) is a closed path.

The construction of the dual line segment complex is meaningful for all complexes satisfying just the axioms A.1 to A.6.

$\mathfrak{D}_1$ is called the line segment complex dual to $\mathfrak{F}$ when each surface piece of $\mathfrak{F}$ is asssociated with a point $\Delta(f) = p'$ of $\mathfrak{D}_1$, $\Delta(f) = \Delta(f^{-1})$, and each p' also corresponds to a pair $f^{\pm 1}$, and the pairs $s^{\pm 1}$ of $\mathfrak{F}$ are mapped one-to-one onto the pairs $s'^{\pm 1}$ of $\mathfrak{D}_1$ by

$$\Delta(s^{\pm 1}) = s'^{\pm 1}$$

in such a way that the boundary relations correspond dually. This definition is consistent, because a segment s of $\mathfrak{F}$ either bounds a surface piece doubly, or else it bounds two different surface pieces singly. If axiom A.7 is also satisfied, then $\mathfrak{D}$ is connected. Namely, each star in $\mathfrak{F}$ corresponds to a closed path in $\mathfrak{D}_1$. If the star v contains a segment equal, though perhaps oppositely directed, to a segment of a star v', then these correspond to paths in $\mathfrak{D}_1$ running through the same segment. If f_1 and f_2 are two surface pieces of $\mathfrak{F}$ which contain in their boundary points p_1, p_2 bounding the same segment s, then one can connect $\Delta(f_1)$ and $\Delta(f_2)$ in $\mathfrak{D}_1$. For if s_i is a segment belonging to the boundary path of f_i and bounded by p_i then there is a star v_i of the segments around p_i which contains s and s_i $(i = 1,2)$. But in $\mathfrak{D}_1$ the v_i correspond to two paths w_i which run through both the segments $\Delta(s^{\pm 1})$, and consequently they permit $\Delta(f_1)$ to be connected to $\Delta(f_2)$ by a path in $\mathfrak{D}_1$. It then follows by induction that $\mathfrak{D}_1$ is connected; since $\mathfrak{F}$ is connected, any two surface pieces f_1 and f_2 contain points p_1 and p_2 respectively which may be connected by a simple path.

For a manifold $\mathfrak{F}$ this means that any two surface pieces of $\mathfrak{F}$ may be embedded in a chain of surface pieces in which any two successive members meet along a common segment.

In order to complete the dual surface complex $\mathfrak{D}$ from $\mathfrak{D}_1$ we cannot omit the hypothesis that each point of $\mathfrak{F}$ bounds only finitely many segments.

5.7 Elementary Transformations

The most important properties of a complex, e.g. those required for the existence of coverings, are preserved by certain simple alterations of the complexes, the so-called elementary transformations. It is therefore useful to divide the complexes into classes, in which a given complex is grouped with all those resulting from it by elementary transformations.

If $\mathfrak{F}$ is any surface complex containing the segment s beginning at p_1 and ending at p_2, then by an *elementary extension of the first kind* we mean the construction of a complex $\mathfrak{F}'$ which contains all the elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ apart from $s^{\pm 1}$, and in place of $s^{\pm 1}$ it has segments $s_1^{\pm 1}, s_2^{\pm 1}$ and an additional point p'. The segment s_i begins at p_i $(i = 1,2)$ and ends at p'. In all boundary paths of surface pieces which contain s, s is replaced by $s_1 s_2^{-1}$ and s^{-1} by $s_2 s_1^{-1}$.

By an *elementary reduction of the first kind* we mean the inverse process, which carries $\mathfrak{F}'$ to $\mathfrak{F}$. $\mathfrak{F}$ contains all points of $\mathfrak{F}'$ except a p' which bounds exactly two segments; the latter are replaced by a single segment.

By an *elementary extension of the second kind* we mean the following construction of a complex $\mathfrak{F}'$ from $\mathfrak{F}$: let f be a surface piece of $\mathfrak{F}$ with boundary path

$$w = w_1 w_2,$$

where w_1 begins at p_1 and ends at p_2. The new complex $\mathfrak{F}'$ is constructed by taking all elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ apart from $f^{\pm 1}$, and in its place taking two surface pairs $f_1^{\pm 1}, f_2^{\pm 1}$ and a segment s' which begins at p_1 and ends at p_2, together with s'^{-1}; $w_1 s'^{-1}$ is the boundary path of f_1 and $s' w_2$ is the boundary path of f_2. We can have $p_1 = p_2$ and w_1 or w_2 may also be empty.

By an *elementary reduction of the second kind* we mean the inverse process, converting $\mathfrak{F}'$ to $\mathfrak{F}$. Thus $\mathfrak{F}$ contains all the segments of $\mathfrak{F}'$ except $s'^{\pm 1}$, and all the surface pieces except $f_1^{\pm 1}, f_2^{\pm 1}$, which are replaced by $f^{\pm 1}$. The segment s' appears exactly once in the boundary paths of f_1 and f_2, and in no other boundary path of a surface piece in $\mathfrak{F}'$.

Reductions and extensions which involve different elements of the original complex can be interchanged with each other or thought of as occurring simultaneously. E.g. if $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n$ are n segments of a complex $\mathfrak{F}$ and if n new points $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n$ are introduced successively so as to replace the segments in question by $2n$ segments s_{1i}, s_{2i} $(i = 1, 2 \ldots, n)$, converting $\mathfrak{F}$ to a complex $\mathfrak{F}'$ in which p_i bounds just s_{1i} and s_{2i}, then these modifications can be performed in any order, and they can be thought of simultaneously as a single modification of general type. Such modifications, composed of interchangeable reductions and extensions of a complex $\mathfrak{F}$, will be called *elementary transformations.* They can also be composed of infinitely many such modifications.

Two complexes $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{F}'$ are called elementarily related if there is a chain of complexes

$$\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{F}_1, \quad \mathfrak{F}_2, \quad \ldots, \quad \mathfrak{F}_r = \mathfrak{F}',$$

beginning with $\mathfrak{F}$ and ending with $\mathfrak{F}'$ and in which $\mathfrak{F}_{i+1}$ results from $\mathfrak{F}_i$ by an elementary transformation. If $\mathfrak{F}$ is elementarily related to $\mathfrak{F}'$ then so is $\mathfrak{F}'$ to $\mathfrak{F}$, and if $\mathfrak{F}$ is elementarily related to $\mathfrak{F}'$, and $\mathfrak{F}'$ to $\mathfrak{F}''$, then $\mathfrak{F}$ is also elementarily related to $\mathfrak{F}''$.

Each complex $\mathfrak{F}$ is elementarily related to one with no singular elements. First, one can replace all singular segments by non-singular ones by elementary extensions of the first kind. If $w = w_1 w_2$ is a boundary path of f in the resulting complex then w certainly runs through two different points p_1 and p_2, and indeed we may take w_1 running from p_1 to p_2. We add a segment s which goes from p_1 to p_2 and

replace f by f_1 and f_2 with boundary paths $w_1 s^{-1}$ and $s w_2$ respectively. We replace s by $s_1 s_2$ by adding a new point q. Now

$$w_1 = s_{\alpha_1} s_{\alpha_2} \cdots s_{\alpha_k}$$

runs successively through the points

$$p_1, \quad p_{\alpha_1}, \quad p_{\alpha_2}, \quad \ldots, \quad p_{\alpha_k} = p_2$$

and

$$w_2 = s_{\alpha_{k+1}} s_{\alpha_{k+2}} \cdots s_{\alpha_m}$$

through the points

$$p_2 = p_{\alpha_{k+1}}, \quad \ldots, \quad p_{\alpha_m} = p_1,$$

so let

$$t_{\alpha_1}, \quad \ldots, \quad t_{\alpha_{k-1}}, \quad t_{\alpha_k} = s_2, \quad t_{\alpha_{k+1}}, \quad \ldots, \quad t_{\alpha_{m-1}}, \quad t_{\alpha_m} = s_1^{-1}$$

be m different segments which begin at q and end at p_{α_i}. Then f_i is replaced by the m triangles f_{α_i} with boundary path $t_{\alpha_i} s_{\alpha_i} t_{\alpha_{i+1}}^{-1}$, so the f_{α_i} are not singular. In this way we can eliminate each singular surface piece.

5.8 Elementary Relatedness of Manifolds

If $\mathfrak{M}$ is a manifold and $\mathfrak{M}'$ is elementarily related to $\mathfrak{M}$, then $\mathfrak{M}'$ is also a manifold.

If $\mathfrak{M}$ is a manifold of finitely many elements, and $\mathfrak{D}$ is its dual, then $\mathfrak{M}$ is elementarily related to $\mathfrak{D}$. This is because the passage from $\mathfrak{M}$ to $\mathfrak{M}''$ may be accomplished by elementary extensions, and that from $\mathfrak{M}''$ to $\mathfrak{D}$ by elementary reductions.

For a manifold $\mathfrak{M}$ the following modifications may be accomplished by elementary transformations:

If p_1 and p_2 are two points of $\mathfrak{M}$ connected by a segment s, and if f_1 and f_2 are two distinct surface pieces with simple boundaries $s w_1$ and $s^{-1} w_2$ containing the segment s, then let $\mathfrak{M}^*$ be the complex which results from $\mathfrak{M}$ by omitting the segment $s^{\pm 1}$, replacing p_1 and p_2 by a point p^*, and replacing the segments s_i in $\mathfrak{M}$ which begin at p_1 or p_2 by segments s_i^* which begin at p^* and end at the same points. The boundary paths in $\mathfrak{M}^*$ result from those of $\mathfrak{M}$ by replacing segments s_i by the corresponding s_i^* and eliminating occurrences of the segment s. $\mathfrak{M}^*$ is then a manifold elementarily equivalent to $\mathfrak{M}$. Namely, if $\mathfrak{D}$ and $\mathfrak{D}^*$ are the manifolds dual to $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{M}^*$ respectively then $\mathfrak{D}^*$ results from $\mathfrak{D}$ by an elementary reduction of the second kind. We will call these transformations *reductions of the third kind.*

They can always be carried out when a segment other than s emanates from one of the two points p_i. The transformations of the inverse type, in which one point is replaced by two, may be simply called *extensions of the third kind.*

If f_1 and f_2 are two distinct surface pieces of a manifold, if $w_1 s^{-1}$ is a boundary path of f_1, $s w_2$ is a boundary path of f_2, and if either w_1 or w_2 is non-empty, then f_1 and f_2 may be replaced by the surface piece f with boundary path $w_1 w_2$.

If the boundary path of f_1 and f_2 is equal to s, then $\mathfrak{M}$ consists only of these two surface pieces and this segment, together with their inverses and a single point p.

This is so because only one segment s emanates from p, so p cannot be connected to any other point of the one-dimensional complex contained in $\mathfrak{M}$. But, since this complex is connected, it consists only of s, s^{-1} and p. It follows that:

Each manifold $\mathfrak{M}$ of finitely many elements is elementarily related to a manifold $\mathfrak{M}'$ which contains only one surface piece pair, or else to a manifold which contains two surface piece pairs and a singular segment, together with their inverses.

Namely, suppose there was a manifold with $k > 1$ surface pieces in which the surface piece f_1 cannot be combined with any other f_2 by an elementary reduction. Then a boundary path of f_1 must run twice through all segments it contains. But then the surface piece f_1 must correspond to a point $\Delta(f_1)$ in the dual complex which bounds only singular segments. Thus if there were another surface piece $f_2 \neq f_1, f_1^{-1}$ the dual complex would not be connected. It then follows also:

A manifold $\mathfrak{M}$ of finitely many elements is elementarily related to a manifold of two surface piece pairs, a line segment pair, and a point; or to a manifold of a surface piece pair, two points and two line segment pairs; or to a manifold which contains only a surface piece pair $f^{\pm 1}$ and a point p.

Namely, let $\mathfrak{M}'$ be a manifold elementarily equivalent to $\mathfrak{M}$ which contains only one surface piece pair, and let $\mathfrak{D}'$ be the manifold dual to $\mathfrak{M}'$. Then $\mathfrak{D}'$ contains only one point p', and furthermore $\mathfrak{D}'$ may be converted, by elementary reductions of the second kind, into a manifold $\mathfrak{D}^*$ which contains only the point p' and either a single surface piece or two surface pieces and one line segment. Since $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{M}'$, $\mathfrak{M}'$ and $\mathfrak{D}'$, $\mathfrak{D}'$ and $\mathfrak{D}^*$ are elementarily related, so are $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{D}^*$.

The latter may be obtained by transformations of manifolds that unify two points. Such transformations can be carried out except when only a single segment emanates from each point. But then the manifold consists of only two points and a pair of regular segments, since the line segment subcomplex is connected. The dual of such a manifold consists of two surface piece pairs, a pair of singular segments, and a point.

5.9 Reduction to Normal Form

One can generally bring a manifold $\mathfrak{M}$ into normal form in various ways by elementary reductions. However, these possibilities are easy to survey. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be the one-dimensional line segment complex contained in $\mathfrak{M}$, $\mathfrak{C}'$ the one-dimensional line segment complex manifold of the manifold $\mathfrak{D} = \Delta(\mathfrak{M})$ dual to $\mathfrak{M}$, $\mathfrak{B}$ any spanning tree of $\mathfrak{C}$, and $\mathfrak{B}'$ such a tree in $\mathfrak{C}'$. We call $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B}'$ *compatible* if there is no segment of $\mathfrak{B}'$ which corresponds to a segment of $\mathfrak{B}$ under the dual mapping. It is not claimed initially that compatible trees $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B}'$ must exist. However, we show:

Each pair of compatible trees $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{B}'$ corresponds to a chain of reductions of the second and third kind, unique up to the order of the reductions, which brings the manifold into normal form. Conversely, each chain of such reductions corresponds to a pair of compatible trees $\mathfrak{B}$, $\mathfrak{B}'$.

Namely, if s is a segment in $\mathfrak{B}$, then s can be removed by a reduction of the third kind when $\mathfrak{M}$ is not already in normal form. For if s is a regular segment and no other segments emanate from its endpoints then $\mathfrak{M}$ is in fact in normal form. Further, if

s^* is a segment corresponding to a segment s' of $\mathfrak{B}'$ under the dual mapping then s^* may be removed by a reduction of the second kind, or else $\mathfrak{M}$ is a normal form because two different surface pieces meet along s^*. Now if $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ is a manifold resulting from $\mathfrak{M}$ by a reduction of the third kind, let $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}$ be the complex resulting from $\mathfrak{B}$ by elimination of the segment s and the point p_2, with all the segments that emanated from p_2 now emanating from p_1. $\overline{\mathfrak{B}'}$ is identical with $\mathfrak{B}'$. Then $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}, \overline{\mathfrak{B}'}$ again constitute a pair of compatible trees. One reaches an analogous conclusion for reductions of the second kind.

Conversely, given a chain of reductions which bring $\mathfrak{M}$ into a normal form with one point and one surface piece, the collection of segments removed by reductions of the third kind form a spanning tree $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{M}$, and the segments corresponding to those removed by reductions of the second kind in the dual complex form a tree $\mathfrak{B}'$, compatible with $\mathfrak{B}$, which contains all points of the dual complex. This is certainly true for those manifolds $\mathfrak{M}$ which may be brought into normal form by a single reduction or extension. Now if $\mathfrak{B}$ is any tree which contains all points of the manifold $\mathfrak{M}$, and if $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ goes into $\mathfrak{M}$ by an extension of the third kind, in which the regular segment s is added and the point p is divided into the points p_1 and p_2, then the complex $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}$ of all the points of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$, the segments in $\mathfrak{B}$, and those corresponding to them in $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$, and the newly added segment s, is again a tree. If $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{B}'$ were a pair of compatible trees associated with the manifold $\mathfrak{M}$ via a chain of reductions to the normal form, then the trees $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{B}'} = \mathfrak{B}'$ are a pair of compatible trees of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$, and in fact those associated with the chain of reductions of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ to its normal form. One reaches this conclusion analogously when $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}$ results from $\mathfrak{M}$ by an extension of the second kind.

If the normal form has two points and a surface piece pair, then the complex of segments eliminated by reductions of the third kind consists of two components, $\mathfrak{B}_1$ and $\mathfrak{B}_2$, which are both trees. On the other hand, the line segment complex of the dual manifold $\mathfrak{B}'$ is a tree. We can construct a tree compatible with $\mathfrak{B}'$ from $\mathfrak{B}_1$ and $\mathfrak{B}_2$ by adding one of the segments contained in the normal form to $\mathfrak{B}_1$ and $\mathfrak{B}_2$.

5.10 Neighboring Normal Forms

In order to survey all classes of elementarily equivalent manifolds of finitely many elements we need only classify the manifolds containing a single point and a surface piece pair. We show that each such manifold may be brought into one of the normal forms given in Section 5.11. This takes place through a series of steps we first describe as follows:

In $\mathfrak{M}$ is a manifold and

$$w = w_1 s w_2 w_3 s w_4, \quad \text{respectively,} \quad w = w_1 s w_2 w_3 s^{-1} w_4$$

is a boundary path of a surface piece f, let $\mathfrak{M}'$ be the manifold consisting of a surface piece f' with boundary path

$$w' = s^* w_3 w_1^{-1} s^* w_2^{-1} w_4, \tag{1}$$

respectively,

$$w' = s^* w_3 w_1^{-1} s^{*-1} w_2^{-1} w_4, \tag{2}$$

a manifold in which the segment s is replaced by s^*. $\mathfrak{M}'$ is elementarily related to $\mathfrak{M}$, and $\mathfrak{M}'$ *is called a neighbor of* $\mathfrak{M}$.

Namely, if

$$w = w_1 s w_2 w_3 s w_4,$$

let $\mathfrak{M}''$ be the manifold of two surface pieces f_1 and f_2 with respective boundary paths

$$w_1 s w_2 s^{*-1} \quad \text{and} \quad s^* w_3 s w_4.$$

Then $s w_2 s^{*-1} w_1$ or $w_1^{-1} s^* w_2^{-1} s^{-1}$ is also a boundary path of f_2. We now construct $\mathfrak{M}'$ in which we replace f_1 and f_2 by the surface piece f' with boundary path

$$w_1^{-1} s^* w_2^{-1} w_4 s^* w_3.$$

The latter is a cyclic interchange of (1) and, since $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{M}''$, $\mathfrak{M}''$ and $\mathfrak{M}'$ are elementarily related, the assertion is proved in this case.

If

$$w = w_1 s w_2 w_3 s^{-1} w_4,$$

let $\mathfrak{M}''$ be the manifold of two surface pieces f_1 and f_2 with the respective boundary paths

$$w_1 s w_2 s^{*-1} \quad \text{and} \quad s^* w_3 s^{-1} w_4.$$

Then $w_2 s^{*-1} w_1 s$ is also a boundary path of f_1 and $s^{-1} w_4 s^* w_3$ is one of f_2. We now construct the manifold $\mathfrak{M}'$ in which f_1 and f_2 are replaced by f' with the boundary path

$$w_2 s^{*-1} w_1 w_4 s^* w_3,$$

which is a cyclic interchange of (2). The assertion now follows.

Any one of the modifications given can be replaced by a chain of simple steps in which one subdivides a surface piece in such a way that at least one triangle is produced.

5.11 Canonical Normal Forms

We proceed to our goal in stages.[2]

Theorem 1. *If w is a boundary path of f and s is a segment traversed twice in the same direction by w, then there is a manifold $\mathfrak{M}^*$, elementarily equivalent to $\mathfrak{M}$, with the boundary path*

$$w^* = s_1^{*2} s_2^{*2} \cdots s_m^{*\,2} w_1^*.$$

Here w_1^* is empty or it traverses each remaining segment once in each direction: s^2 denotes the path ss.

[2] For this section see also: F. LEVI, Geometrischen Konfigurationen, Leipzig, 1929.

If

$$w = s\,w_2\,s\,w_4$$

is a boundary path of f, then by Section 5.10 the manifold $\mathfrak{M}'$, in which f' has the boundary path

$$s_1^{*2} w_2^{-1} w_4,$$

is a neighbor of $\mathfrak{M}$. Now let

$$s_1^{*2} s_2^{*2} \cdots s_i^{*2} w_1 s_{i+1} w_2 s_{i+1} w_3$$

be the boundary path of a manifold $\mathfrak{M}^*$ elementarily related to $\mathfrak{M}$. Then

$$w_1 s_{i+1} w_2 s_{i+1} w_3 s_1^{*2} s_2^{*2} \cdots s_i^{*2}$$

is also a boundary path and hence (with $w_3 s_1^{*2} s_2^{*2} \cdots s_i^{*2}$ playing the role of w_4 in Section 5.10)

$$s_{i+1}^* w_1 w_2^{-1} s_{i+1}^* w_3 s_1^{*2} s_2^{*2} \cdots s_i^{*2}$$

is the boundary path of a manifold $\overline{\mathfrak{M}^*}$ neighboring $\mathfrak{M}^*$. Letting $w_2 w_1^{-1}$ play the role of w_4 in Section 5.10 we obtain

$$s_{i+1}^{*\,2} w_1 w_2^{-1} w_3 s_1^{*2} s_2^{*2} \cdots s_i^{*2},$$

or,

$$s_1^{*2} s_2^{*2} \cdots s_i^{*2} s_{i+1}^{*\,2} w'$$

as the boundary path of a manifold elementarily related to $\mathfrak{M}$. The assertion follows by induction.

To further normalize the boundary path we prove:

Theorem 2. *Let $w = w_1 w_2 w_3$ be a boundary path in a manifold $\mathfrak{M}$, where w_2 runs through any segment in both directions if it runs through it at all, and let*

$$w_2 = w_{21} k_1 w_{22} k_2 \cdots w_{2r} k_r w_{2,r+1},$$

where

$$k_i = s_{i1} s_{i2} s_{i1}^{-1} s_{i2}^{-1}.$$

Then there are two segment pairs, s_1, s_1^{-1} and s_2, s_2^{-1}, among the w_{2i} which mutually separate each other or else the w_{2i} are empty. That is, with suitable numbering w_2 runs first through s_1, then s_2, then s_1 again, then s_2 again.

We consider the subpaths of w_2 of the form $s\,w's^{-1}$, where s is traversed by the w_{2i}. There is a certain shortest path of this kind; let it be $s_1 w' s_1^{-1}$. Then w' is certainly not empty, for the s are singular segments and by Section 5.3 a path of singular segments is reduced. But w' also cannot consist only of the elements k_i, because

$$s\,k_i k_{i+1} \cdots k_{i+l} s^{-1}$$

cannot appear in a boundary path by Section 5.3. If w' passes through s_2, where s_2 is also traversed by the w_{2i}, then w' runs through the segment s_2 only once. Otherwise,

the subpath $s_2 w' s_2^{-1}$ of w_2 would be shorter than $s_1 w' s_1^{-1}$. Thus the line segment pairs s_1, s_1^{-1} and s_2, s_2^{-1} separate each other in w_2.

Theorem 3. *If the paths w_{2i} in (1) are not empty then there is a manifold neighboring $\mathfrak{M}$ with a boundary path*

$$w' = w_1 w_2' w_3,$$

where w_2' contains one more element of the form $k = s_1 s_2 s_1^{-1} s_2^{-1}$ then w.

The path w_2 contains two line segment pairs, s_1, s_1^{-1} and s_2, s_2^{-1}, which mutually separate.

We therefore set

$$w_2 = w_{21}' s_1 w_{22}' s_2 w_{23}' s_1^{-1} w_{24}' s_2^{-1} w_{25}'.$$

Now we go to a neighboring manifold by replacing s_2 by s_2^* and construct the new boundary path

$$w_1 w_{21}' s_1 s_2^* s_1^{-1} w_{24}' w_{23}' s_2^{*-1} w_{22}' w_{25}' w_3,$$

then go to a further neighboring manifold in which we replace s_1 by s_1^* and construct the boundary path

$$w_1 w_{21}' w_{23}' w_{24}' s_1^* s_2^* s_1^{*-1} s_2^{*-1} w_{22}' w_{25}' w_3.$$

Here we have

$$s_1^* s_2^* s_1^{*-1} s_2^{*-1} = k^*$$

as a new element of the required form, while none of the paths k_i in w_2 has been destroyed. It follows immediately from the second and third theorems that:

Theorem 4. *If a boundary path w of a manifold runs through each segment in both directions, then there is an elementarily related manifold having the boundary path*

$$w' = k_1 k_2 \cdots k_g \quad \textit{with} \quad k_i = s_{1i} s_{2i} s_{1i}^{-1} s_{2i}^{-1} \quad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, g). \tag{2}$$

If a boundary path w of a manifold runs through a segment twice in the same direction then there is an elementarily related manifold whose boundary path is either

$$w' = s_1^2 s_2^2 \cdots s_g^2$$

or

$$w' = s_1^2 s_2^2 \cdots s_m^2 k_1 k_2 \cdots k_n \tag{3}$$

where

$$k_i = s_{1i} s_{2i} s_{1i}^{-1} s_{2i}^{-1} \quad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n).$$

We show finally:

Theorem 5. *If a boundary path of a manifold runs through a segment twice in the same direction, then there is an elementarily related manifold with boundary path*

$$w' = s_1^2 s_2^2 \cdots s_g^2.$$

To prove this we show that the "commutator" k_1 in (3) may be replaced by two "squares" s^2. Let

$$w'' = s_m^2 s_{11} s_{12} s_{11}^{-1} s_{12}^{-1} w_1$$

be a boundary path which results from (3) by cyclic interchange. We go over to a neighboring manifold in which s_m is replaced by s_m^* and take

$$\overline{w}'' = s_m^* s_{12}^{-1} s_{11}^{-1} s_m^* s_{11}^{-1} s_{12}^{-1} w_1$$

as boundary path; then replace s_{11} by s_{11}^* and take

$$\overline{\overline{w}}'' = s_m^* s_{12}^{-1} s_{11}^{*\,-1} s_{11}^{*\,-1} s_m^{*\,-1} s_{12}^{-1} w_1$$

as boundary path, and finally replace s_{12} by s_{12}^* and take

$$w^* = s_m^* s_m^* s_{11}^* s_{11}^* s_{12}^* s_{12}^* w_1$$

as boundary path. The manifolds with the boundary paths (2) and (4), together with the manifold of a surface piece pair, two points, and a line segment pair, may be called "canonical normal forms."

5.12 Normal Forms with Retention of a Segment

To refine the results above we investigate what normal forms are obtainable when a segment s of the original boundary path is retained throughout, while the remaining segments may be replaced as before.

Firstly, the form

$$w = s_1^2 s_2^2 \cdots s_m^2 w_1 s w_2 s^\varepsilon w_3 \qquad (\varepsilon = \pm 1)$$

may be attained by introduction of suitable segments $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_m$, where w_1, w_2, w_3 together run through all their segments in both directions. By introduction of

$$s_i' = s_i w_1, \quad s_i'' = w_i^{-1} s_i' \qquad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, m)$$

this may be replaced by

$$w' = s_1''^2 s_2''^2 \cdots s_m''^{\,2} s w_2 s^\varepsilon w_3 w_1.$$

Hence, with a new notation, we can start with the form

$$w = s_1^2 s_2^2 \cdots s_m^2 s w_1 s^\varepsilon w_2 \qquad (\varepsilon = \pm 1). \tag{1}$$

1. Now either w_1 already traverses one of its segments in both directions, in which case the same holds for w_2, and by introduction of new segments w_1 and w_2 may each be replaced by a path of commutators. Then, by Section 5.3, ε must be $+1$. If w_2 begins with $s_\alpha s_\beta s_\alpha^{-1} s_\beta^{-1}$ then the subpath $s s_\alpha s_\beta s_\alpha^{-1} s_\beta^{-1}$ may be replaced successively by

$$s_\alpha' s_\beta s_\alpha'^{\,-1} s s_\beta^{-1}, \quad s_\alpha' s_\beta' s s_\alpha'^{\,-1} s_\beta'^{\,-1}, \quad s_\alpha'' s s_\beta' s_\alpha''^{-1} s_\beta'^{\,-1}, \quad s_\alpha'' s_\beta'' s_\alpha''^{-1} s_\beta''^{-1} s \tag{2}$$

By applying such steps we convert w into

$$s_1^2 s_2^2 \cdots s_m^2 w_1' w_2' s^2,$$

and then, if $m \neq 0$, into a path of squares, as in Section 5.11:

$$s_1^2 s_2^2 \cdots s_m^2 s^2.$$

2. Otherwise, there is a segment t which is traversed once by w_1 and once, in the opposite sense, by w_2. Then we can take

$$w_1 = w_{11} t w_{12} = t'$$

as a new segment and obtain

$$w = s_1^2 s_2^2 \cdots s_m^2 s t' s^\varepsilon w_1' t'^{-1} w_2', \tag{3}$$

where each commutator that appeared in w_1 and w_2 also appears in w_1' and w_2'. Now either w_1' and w_2' consist only of commutators, or $w_1' w_2'$ is empty, or there is a mutually separating pair of segments in

$$t' s^\varepsilon w_1' t'^{-1} w_2'$$

which do not belong to the commutators. But then, using the modifications in Section 5.10, this segment pair may be replaced by a new one which is a commutator. As a result,

$$t' s^\varepsilon w_1' t'^{-1} w_2 \quad \text{becomes} \quad w_1'' s^\varepsilon w_2''.$$

By repeating these modifications we obtain the form (1) or (3) where w_i, w_i' respectively consist only of commutators and, using the deformations in (2), we can convert this into

$$w = s_1^2 s_2^2 \cdots s_m^2 w_3 s t s^\varepsilon t^{-1},$$

where w_3 consists only of commutators. Hence when $m \neq 0$ we can again convert it into squares.

Further, we can also arrive at $\varepsilon = +1$ in the case $m = 0$. For

$$s t s^{-1} t^{-1} s_1^2 w'$$

may be converted into

$$s t s_1' t s s_1' w'$$

by introduction of $s^{-1} t^{-1} s_1 = s_1'$. It follows that:

If the boundary path runs through each segment in both directions, then the second normal form may be attained with retention of an arbitrary segment.

If the boundary path does not run through each segment in both directions, there are four cases to distinguish:

Let the boundary be w and the retained segment s.

1. The path w runs through s twice in the same direction ($\varepsilon = +1$). We have

$$\text{a)} \quad w' = k_1 k_2 \cdots k_r s^2 \qquad \text{or} \qquad \text{b)} \quad w' = k_1 k_2 \cdots k_r s t s^{-1} t^{-1}.$$

2. There is a segment other than s which w runs through twice in the same direction. We have

$$\text{a)} \quad w' = s_1^2 s_2^2 \cdots s_n^2 s^2 \qquad \text{or} \qquad \text{b)} \quad w' = s_1^2 s_2^2 \cdots s_n^2 s t s^{-1} t^{-1}.$$

We will see in Sections 6.6 and 6.7 that these cases cannot be reduced to each other.

5.13 Orientability. Characteristic

In order to conclude the classification of manifolds with finitely many elements, we must determine whether normal forms can be elementarily related to each other. This is not the case. The proof is based on the invariance of two properties of a manifold under elementary transformations: *orientability* and *characteristic*.[3]

Let $f_1^{\pm 1}, f_2^{\pm 1}, \ldots, f_n^{\pm 1}$ be the different surface pieces of a manifold. Let w_i^{ε} be a be a positive boundary path of f_i^{ε} ($\varepsilon = \pm 1$). Now if the surface pieces

$$f_1^{\varepsilon_1}, \quad f_2^{\varepsilon_2}, \quad \cdots, \quad f_n^{\varepsilon_n}$$

may be chosen in such a way that the boundary paths $w_i^{\varepsilon_i}$ traverse each segment s ($\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$) once in the positive sense and once in the negative sense, the manifold is called orientable.

If

$$f_1^{\varepsilon_1}, \quad f_2^{\varepsilon_2}, \quad \cdots, \quad f_n^{\varepsilon_n}$$

is a choice which satisfies our condition, then so too is

$$f_1^{-\varepsilon_1}, \quad f_2^{-\varepsilon_2}, \quad \cdots, \quad f_n^{-\varepsilon_n}.$$

However, there is no choice apart from these two. Because, if the exponent η_1 is chosen in $f_1^{\eta_1}$ then the exponent for all surface pieces meeting it is already determined. Then one deduces the assertion with the help of Section 5.6.

The *invariance of orientability* under elementary transformations is easy to see. If $\mathfrak{M}'$ results from $\mathfrak{M}$ by an elementary transformation of the first kind then we retain the choice of surface pieces for $\mathfrak{M}'$. If $\mathfrak{M}'$ results from $\mathfrak{M}$ by an elementary transformation of the second kind, and if f_i is replaced by f_{i1}, f_{i2} as a result, let

$$w_i = w_{i1} w_{i2}$$

and let $w_{i1} s'^{-1}$ be a positive boundary path of f_{i1} and $s' w_{i2}$ a positive boundary path of f_{i2}. We now replace

$$f_i^{\varepsilon_i} \quad \text{by} \quad f_{i1}^{\varepsilon_i}, f_{i1}^{\varepsilon_i}$$

in the choice of surface pieces and note that the segments appearing in the w_i, as well as the new segment s', are traversed as the rule requires.

One sees similarly: if $\mathfrak{M}'$ is orientable, so is $\mathfrak{M}$. Namely, if $f_{i1}^{\varepsilon_{i1}}, f_{i2}^{\varepsilon_{i2}}$ are two surface pieces meeting along s' which appear in a choice of surface pieces orienting $\mathfrak{M}'$,

[3] Usually called the (negative) *Euler* characteristic today. (Translator's note.)

then let $w_{i1}s'^{-1}$ be a boundary path of $f_{i1}^{\varepsilon_{i1}}$ and let $s'w_{i2}$ be a boundary path of $f_{i2}^{\varepsilon_{i2}}$. By hypothesis these boundary paths run through s' in opposite directions. We now replace

$$f_{i1}^{\varepsilon_{i1}}, f_{i2}^{\varepsilon_{i2}} \quad \text{by} \quad f_i^{\varepsilon_i},$$

with the boundary path $w_{i1}w_{i2}$.

Conversely, it follows immediately that if $\mathfrak{M}$ is a non-orientable manifold and $\mathfrak{M}'$ results from $\mathfrak{M}$ by an elementary transformation then $\mathfrak{M}'$ is also non-orientable. For if $\mathfrak{M}'$ were orientable, $\mathfrak{M}$ would be too.

As soon as a cycle of segments beginning at a point contains more than two segments one can distinguish between a positive cycle $s_{\alpha_1}, s_{\alpha_2}, \ldots, s_{\alpha_r}$ and a negative one $s_{\alpha_r}, s_{\alpha_{r-1}}, \ldots, s_{\alpha_1}$. For orientable manifolds one can also determine positive paths in such a way that the following holds: if

$$\ldots, s_{\alpha_1}, s, s_{\alpha_2}, \ldots \quad \text{and} \quad \ldots, s_{\beta_2}, s^{-1}, s_{\beta_1}, \ldots$$

are the positive cycles in which the segment s appears and if sw_1, sw_2 are the two simple boundary paths beginning with s, then with suitable numbering w_i begins with $s_{\alpha_i}^{-1}$ and ends with s_{β_i}. If positive cycles cannot be defined in this way then the surface is not orientable. However, if they can be, it does not follow that the surface must be orientable, as one sees from the surface with one cycle s, s^{-1} and the boundary path s^2.

By the *characteristic* of a surface complex $\mathfrak{F}$ of finitely elements—a_0 points, $2a_1$ line segments, and $2a_2$ surface pieces—we mean the number

$$c = -a_0 + a_1 - a_2.$$

If $\mathfrak{F}'$ is a complex resulting from $\mathfrak{F}$ by an elementary extension of the first kind, then the number of points a_0' equals $a_0 + 1$, the number $2a_1'$ of segments equals $2a_1 + 2$, the number $2a_2'$ of surface pieces equals $2a_2$ and hence

$$-a_0 + a_1 - a_2 = -a_0' + a_1' - a_2'.$$

One concludes similarly for elementary reductions of the first kind. If $\mathfrak{F}'$ results from $\mathfrak{F}$ by an elementary extension of the second kind, then the numbers a_0', a_1', a_2' for points, lines, and surfaces are

$$a_0' = a_0, \quad 2a_1' = 2a_1 + 2, \quad 2a_2' = 2a_2 + 2,$$

so the invariance of c again follows. One concludes similarly for elementary reductions of the second kind.

If we apply these two concepts to the normal forms of manifolds we see that the manifolds of Section 5.11 (2) are orientable, and the manifolds of Section 5.11 (4) are not. In the manifold of one surface piece, one line segment, and two points the chacteristic has value -2 and in the manifolds of Section 5.11 (2) the value $2g - 2$ (g is called the *genus* of these manifolds), and in the manifolds of Section 5.11 (4) the value g. Thus different normal forms are not elementarily related to each other. Further:

Two manifolds are elementarily related if they are both orientable or both non-orientable, and have the same characteristic.

The manifolds of Section 5.11 (2) can be visualized as spheres with g handles, the manifolds of Section 5.11 (4) as spheres with g projective planes inserted.

Chapter 6

Groups and Surface Complexes

6.1 The Fundamental Group of a Surface Complex

We now address ourselves to the connection between groups and surface complexes which is realized on the one hand by paths in the complexes, and on the other by coverings of complexes, quite analogously as with line segment complexes. Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a connected surface complex and let $\mathfrak{C}$ be the connected line segment complex contained in it.

Let $\mathfrak{W}_\mathfrak{C}$ be the group of closed paths in $\mathfrak{C}$ that originate at p_0. With the help of boundary paths in $\mathfrak{F}$ we now define an invariant subgroup $\mathfrak{R}$ of $\mathfrak{W}_\mathfrak{C}$ and a system of defining relations of a group $\mathfrak{W}_\mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{R} = \mathfrak{W}_\mathfrak{F}$, which we will call the group of closed paths of $\mathfrak{F}$ beginning at p_0.

Let $\mathfrak{B}$ be a tree of segments of $\mathfrak{F}$ which contains all the points of $\mathfrak{F}$ and let S_1, S_2, …, S_n be the system of generators of the fundamental group[1] of $\mathfrak{C}$ with initial point p_0. Let f_i be an arbitrary surface piece of $\mathfrak{F}$, and w_i its boundary path that begins and ends at the point p_k. Further, let w'_k be the simple path from p_0 to p_k in the tree $\mathfrak{B}$, so that $w'_k w_i w'^{-1}_k$ is a closed path beginning at p_0 and if

$$[w'_k w_i w'^{-1}_k] = R_i(S_l)$$

is the power product in the S associated with this path, then R_i is called the *defining relation associated with the surface piece* f_i. The collection of relations obtained in this way is the system of defining relations for $\mathfrak{W}_\mathfrak{F}$. The product R_i is determined up to cyclic interchange and cancellation of formal inverses by f_i, for the segments in w_i alone determine the power product R_i since w'_k occurs in $\mathfrak{B}$.

Our problem is to show that *the group determined in this way is independent of the choice of* $\mathfrak{B}$. So let $\mathfrak{B}'$ be a tree neighboring $\mathfrak{B}$ in $\mathfrak{C}$, let

$$S'_1, S'_2, \ldots, S'_n$$

[1] Recall from Section 4.6 that Reidemeister calls the fundamental group the "path group," and that he uses $\mathfrak{W}$ (fraktur W) to denote this group because the German word for path is "Weg." (Translator's note.)

be the generator system associated with $\mathfrak{B}'$ for the fundamental group of $\mathfrak{C}$ with initial point p_0, and let $R_i'(S_k')$ be a relation associated with the boundary path w_i of the surface piece f_i. But we know from Section 4.6 that the S_k' may be expressed in terms of the S_k. If we now replace $R_i'(S_k')$ by a power product $\overline{R}_i(S_k)$ in the S_k, then $\overline{R}_i(S_k)$ results from $R_i(S_k)$ by elementary manipulations in the free group of the S. Thus all consequence relations of the $R_i'(S_k')$ likewise result from consequence relations of the $R_i(S_k)$. One derives the converse similarly. Thus the invariant subgroup $\mathfrak{R}$ is independent of the choice of tree $\mathfrak{B}$ and hence so is $\mathfrak{W}_\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{W}_\mathfrak{C}/\mathfrak{R}$.

The groups of paths beginning at p_0 and p_0' are isomorphic. Namely, if we take the same tree to define the generators of both groups and the same boundary paths w_i to define the defining relations, then the defining relations are exactly the same. Thus we speak of the fundamental group of $\mathfrak{F}$ to cover all these groups.

6.2 Invariance of the Fundamental Group under Elementary Transformations

The fundamental groups of elementarily related surface complexes are isomorphic.

Let $\mathfrak{F}'$ be a surface complex resulting from $\mathfrak{F}'$ by an elementary extension of the first kind, in which the segment s of $\mathfrak{F}$ with initial point p_i and final point p_k is replaced by the two segments s_1', s_2' with p' the new point, at which s_1' ends and s_2' begins. Now if s is a nonsingular segment there is a tree $\mathfrak{B}$ which contains s and all the points of $\mathfrak{C}$. If we replace the segment s in $\mathfrak{B}$ by s_1', s_2', p then $\mathfrak{B}$ yields a spanning tree $\mathfrak{B}'$ of $\mathfrak{F}'$ and one sees that the definitions of generators and defining relations for the paths emanating from $p_0 \neq p'$ in $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{F}'$ are formally identical when we base them on $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{B}'$ respectively. If $s = s_1$ is a singular segment, so $p_i = p_k$, and $\mathfrak{B}$ is any spanning tree of $\mathfrak{F}$, let $\mathfrak{B}'$ be the tree that consists of $\mathfrak{B}$ with the addition of s_1' and p'. If $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n$ are the segments of $\mathfrak{F}$ that do not belong to $\mathfrak{B}$, then $s_2', s_2, \ldots, s_n$ are the segments of $\mathfrak{F}'$ that do not belong to $\mathfrak{B}'$, and the generators corresponding to the segments $s_2, s_3, \ldots, s_n$ are identical for $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{F}'$. If

$$S_1 = [w s_1 w^{-1}]$$

is the generator corresponding to the segment s_1 in $\mathfrak{F}$ then

$$S_1' = [w s_1' s_2' w^{-1}]$$

is a boundary path that does not contain s_1, corresponding to the one that does not contain s_1', and thus it remains unaltered. If a boundary path in $\mathfrak{F}$ runs through the segment s_1 exactly k times, then the corresponding path in $\mathfrak{F}'$ runs through the path $s_1' s_2'$ exactly k times, and the power product corresponding to this path in $\mathfrak{F}'$ therefore results from that in the S_k when S_1 is replaced by S_1'.

Now let $\mathfrak{F}'$ be a surface complex resulting from $\mathfrak{F}$ by an elementary extension of the second kind, in which the segment s_0', which goes from p_i to p_k, is inserted and the surface piece f with boundary path $w_1 w_2$ is replaced by two surface pieces with the boundary paths $w_1 s_0'^{-1}, s_0' w_2$. If $\mathfrak{B}$ is any spanning tree of $\mathfrak{F}$, then $\mathfrak{B}$ has

the same property in relation to $\mathfrak{F}'$. The generators $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_n$ in $\mathfrak{F}$ are also generators in $\mathfrak{F}'$, and in addition there is a generator S_0' corresponding to the segment s_0'. The relations of $\mathfrak{F}$, except that for the boundary path of f, remain the same. If $R(S_k)$ is the power product corresponding to the boundary path $w_1 w_2$ of f, and if $R_1'(S_k, S_0'), R_2'(S_k, S_0')$ are those corresponding to the paths $w_1 s_0'^{-1}, s_0' w_2$ respectively, then $R_1' R_2'$ is convertible into $R(S_k)$ by elementary reductions in the free group of the S_0', S_k. Thus the fundamental groups associated with $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{F}'$ are isomorphic by the theorem of TIETZE in Section 2.10.

A special isomorphism $\boldsymbol{I}$ between the two fundamental groups $\mathfrak{W}_{\mathfrak{F}}$ and $\mathfrak{W}_{\mathfrak{F}'}$ with respect to a basepoint p common to both complexes $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{F}'$ is obtained by the following argument. If w is a path that appears in $\mathfrak{F}'$ as well as in $\mathfrak{F}$, let

$$\boldsymbol{I}([w]) = [w]'. \tag{1}$$

If $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{F}^{(n)}$ are two complexes convertible into each other by elementary transformations, and if

$$\mathfrak{F}^{(1)} = \mathfrak{F}, \quad \mathfrak{F}^{(2)}, \quad \ldots, \quad \mathfrak{F}^{(n)}$$

is a chain of complexes in which any two in succession are related by an elementary extension or reduction, and if the point p appears in all the complexes $\mathfrak{F}^{(i)}$, and $\boldsymbol{I}_k$ is the isomorphism established by (1) between the fundamental groups with basepoint p in $\mathfrak{F}^{(k)}$ and $\mathfrak{F}^{(k+1)}$,

$$\boldsymbol{I}_k([w]^{(k)}) = [w]^{(k+1)},$$

then

$$\boldsymbol{I}([w]) = \boldsymbol{I}_{n-1}\left(\boldsymbol{I}_{n-2} \cdots \boldsymbol{I}_1([w]^{(1)})\right) = [w]^{(n)}$$

is called *the isomorphism effected by the chain* $\mathfrak{F}^{(i)}$ between the fundamental groups $\mathfrak{W}_{\mathfrak{F}^{(1)}}$ and $\mathfrak{W}_{\mathfrak{F}^{(n)}}$. If there are two different chains that connect $\mathfrak{F}^{(1)}$ and $\mathfrak{F}^{(n)}$, and if they effect isomorphisms $\boldsymbol{I}$ and $\boldsymbol{I}'$, then $\boldsymbol{I}\boldsymbol{I}'^{-1}$ is an automorphism of the fundamental group $\mathfrak{W}_{\mathfrak{F}^{(1)}}$.

6.3 Homotopy and Homology

With the help of the fundamental group, we can classify all the closed paths of a complex independently of the choice of basepoint. Namely, if w is a closed path beginning at p_0, p_1 is any other point, and w_1 is a path from p_1 to p_0, then $w_1 w w_1^{-1}$ is a closed path beginning at p_1 and corresponding to the element $[w_1 w w_1^{-1}]$ in the fundamental group with basepoint p_1. If w_1' is any other path from p_1 to p_0, then $[w_1' w w_1'^{-1}]$ is a transform of $[w_1 w w_1^{-1}]$, namely

$$[w_1' w w_1'^{-1}] = [w_1' w_1^{-1}][w_1 w w_1^{-1}][w_1' w_1^{-1}]^{-1}. \tag{1}$$

Thus a closed path w corresponds to a class of transformed elements in the fundamental group that may be denoted by $\{w\}$. Naturally, different closed paths can

belong to the same class of transformed elements.[2] If w and w^* are two such elements, then

$$\{w\} = \{w^*\} \tag{2}$$

in the fundamental group with basepoint p_1, and this also holds for any other basepoint p_2. For the fundamental groups are in fact isomorphically related to each other by the paths. Thus the relation $\{w\} = \{w^*\}$ depends only on the paths w and w^* themselves. We call paths that satisfy (1) or (2) *homotopic* to each other. This relation is transitive. Obviously, w is homotopic to any path resulting from itself by cyclic interchange. Further, if $w = w_1 w_2 w_3$ and if $w_2 w_2'^{-1}$ is a simple boundary path of a surface piece, then w is homotopic to $w_1 w_2' w_3$. Conversely, one can also use these two theorems to define homotopy.

A path w is called null homotopic when $\{w\}$ is the identity. Thus the problem of deciding whether a path is null homotopic is the same as the word problem, while deciding whether two paths are homotopic is the same as the transformation problem, for the fundamental group. (Cf. Sections 1.14 and 1.15.)

Corresponding to a class $\{w\}$ of conjugate elements there is a well-defined element of the factor group $\mathfrak{W}/\mathfrak{K}$ of the fundamental group by the commutator group, which may be denoted by $\langle w \rangle$. Two paths w and w^* are called *homologous* to each other when $\langle w \rangle = \langle w^* \rangle$. Homology is transitive. We say that a path runs through the segment s_i exactly $k = m - n$ times if it runs through m times in the positive sense and n times in the negative sense, so two paths are certainly homologous if they traverse the same segments equally often. A path is called null homologous when $\langle w \rangle$ is the identity element, i.e. when $\{w\}$ consists of elements of the commutator group. By Section 2.13, homology of curves is always decidable.

6.4 Simple Paths on Manifolds

The concepts of homotopy and homology have special interest in the case of simple closed paths on manifolds. Namely, the homotopy and homology properties of such paths depend on whether and how the manifold may be decomposed. We say that *the path w separates the manifold* $\mathfrak{M}$ when each tree $\mathfrak{B}'$ in the dual complex $\mathfrak{D}$ contains at least one segment corresponding to a segment of w under the dual mapping. If on the other hand there is such a tree containing no such segment then we say that w does not separate the manifold.

Now let w be a simple path of the manifold $\mathfrak{M}$, let $\mathfrak{B}_1$ be a tree consisting of segments of w that includes all points traversed by w, and let $\mathfrak{B}$ be a tree that contains the segments of $\mathfrak{B}_1$ and all the points of $\mathfrak{M}$. If one removes the segments of $\mathfrak{B}$ by reductions of the third kind, then $\mathfrak{M}$ is converted into an equivalent manifold $\mathfrak{M}^*$ containing only a single point, in which w corresponds to a single, and of course singular, segment s^*.

Now either w does not separate the manifold $\mathfrak{M}$ and hence s^* does not separate the manifold $\mathfrak{M}^*$, in which case in the manifold dual to $\mathfrak{M}^*$ there is a tree $\mathfrak{B}^{*\prime}$

[2] This class is what we today call a *conjugacy class.* In fact, Reidemeister calls them conjugate elements in the next paragraph but one. (Translator's note.)

containing all points but not the segment corresponding to s^*, and so $\mathfrak{M}^*$ may be converted into an equivalent manifold of a single point and a surface piece with s^* in its boundary.

Or else w separates $\mathfrak{M}$ and s^* separates $\mathfrak{M}^*$ and no such tree $\mathfrak{B}^{*\prime}$ exists. Then $\mathfrak{M}^*$ may be converted into a manifold $\mathfrak{M}^{**}$ of two surface pieces f_1^{**}, f_2^{**} which meet only along s^*, for otherwise the two surface pieces could be replaced by a single one without removing s^* and thus there would be a tree $\mathfrak{B}^{*\prime}$ in the manifold dual to $\mathfrak{M}^*$ containing all points but not the segment corresponding to s^*. If we denote two boundary paths in $\mathfrak{M}^{**}$ beginning with s^* by $s^{*-1}r_1^{**}, s^{*-1}r_2^{**}$ then, using the manipulations described in Section 5.9, the r_i^{**} may be converted into one of the normal forms $s_1^2 s_2^2 \cdots s_l^2$ or $k_1 k_2 \cdots k_l$ where $k_i = s_{i1}s_{i2}s_{i1}^{-1}s_{i2}^{-1}$; one of these paths may also be empty.

A few simple theorems follow from this.

If $\mathfrak{M}$ is an orientable manifold and w is a simple path that separates $\mathfrak{M}$, then w is null homologous and conversely: if w is a simple path and null homologous then w separates the manifold.

If $\mathfrak{M}$ is not orientable and w is a simple path that separates $\mathfrak{M}$, then either w is null homologous or there is path w' for which

$$\langle w\rangle = \langle w'w'\rangle = \langle w'\rangle^2$$

and conversely: if w is a simple path and either null homologous or homologous to a twice-traversed path $w'w'$ then w separates the manifold $\mathfrak{M}$.

For when w separates we have

$$\langle w\rangle = \langle s^*\rangle = \langle r_1^{**}\rangle$$

and when w does not separate we have

$$\langle w\rangle = \langle s^*\rangle,$$

where s^* is a segment that appears in an equivalent normal form. Hence $\langle s^*\rangle$ is neither the identity element nor the square of another group element.

We will show later that the elements $[r_1^{**}]$ and $[r_2^{**}]$ can only be the identity when one of these paths, say r_1^{**}, is empty. It then follows that

A simple path is null homotopic if and only if it may be converted by reduction of the manifold into a singular segment which is the complete boundary of a surface piece.

6.5 Intersection Numbers

The membership of paths in well-defined homology classes has an important geometric consequence: the appearance of intersection points.[3] In this connection we will confine ourselves to orientable surfaces. Then we can associate an index with each intersection point p of two paths w_1 and w_2 by the following rule: let

$$w_i = w_{i1}s_{i1}^{-1}s_{i2}w_{i2}$$

[3] H. POINCARÉ, Rendic. d. Palermo **13**, 314, (1899).

where the s_{ik} are the segments beginning at the intersection p. When the pairs of segments s_{i1}, s_{i2} $(i = 1,2)$ do not mutually separate in the cycle of segments beginning at p, and thus the paths w_1 and w_2 do not cross at p, then p receives the *index zero*; otherwise *index* $+1$ *or* -1 according as $s_{12}, s_{22}, s_{11}, s_{21}$ appear in that order in the positive or negative cycle of segments beginning at p. We define the index for a common initial or final point of closed paths analogously as for intersection points.

Now if w_1, w_2 are *closed paths* that run through no common segments and pass each intersection point only once, the sum of the indices of all those points is called the *intersection number*

$$N(w_1, w_2)$$

of the two paths w_1 and w_2.

Obviously

$$N(w_1, w_2) = -N(w_2, w_1), \quad N(w_1^{-1}, w_2) = -N(w_1, w_2).$$

One easily establishes the following additional property of the intersection number: if $w_1 = w_{11} w_{12}$, where the w_{1i} are themselves closed paths, then

$$N(w_1, w_2) = N(w_{11}, w_2) + N(w_{12}, w_2).$$

If w_1' is a path homotopic to w_1 which has no segment in common with w_2 then

$$N(w_1', w_2) = N(w_1, w_2).$$

This is proved most conveniently by subdividing the manifold into triangles and following the effect of deformation over a triangle.

In particular, if w_1 and w_1' are two closed paths which begin at the same point p, and if $[w_1'] = [w_1]$ in the fundamental group with basepoint p, then it is permissible to speak of the intersection of the classes $[w_1]$ and $[w_2]$, since it is consistent to set

$$N([w_1], [w_2]) = N(w_1, w_2)$$

and we again have

$$N([w_{11}][w_{12}], [w_2]) = N([w_{11}], [w_2]) + N([w_{12}], [w_2]).$$

If we now fix $[w_2]$ we see that the intersection numbers relative to $[w_2]$ form a commutative group homomorphic to the fundamental group; a path k for which $[k]$ belongs to the commutator group always has the intersection number $N(k, w_2) = 0$, or, expressed in another way: *the intersection number* $N(w_1, w_2)$ *depends only on the homology class* $\langle w_1 \rangle$. We can therefore define a function $N(\langle w_1 \rangle, w_2)$. And because

$$N(w_1, w_2) = -N(w_2, w_1)$$

the same holds for the second argument. In order to complete the determination of

$$N(\langle w_1 \rangle, \langle w_2 \rangle)$$

we set up a system of generators that corresponds to the canonical form of the manifold from Section 5.11 (2), and note that

$$N(S_i, S_k) = N(T_i, T_k) = N(S_i, T_k) = 0 \qquad (i \neq k)$$

and, with suitable ordering of generators,

$$N(S_i, T_i) = 1.$$

Moreover, since for two paths w_k of the homology classes $\prod_i S_i^{a_{ki}} T_i^{b_{ki}}$ $(k = 1, 2)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} N(w_1, w_2) &= N\left(\prod_i S_i^{a_{ki}} T_i^{b_{ki}}, w_2\right) \\ &= \sum a_{1i} N(S_i, w_2) + \sum b_{1i} N(T_i, w_2) \\ &= \sum a_{1i} a_{2k} N(S_i, S_k) + \sum a_{1i} b_{2k} N(S_i, T_k) \\ &+ \sum b_{1i} a_{2k} N(T_i, S_k) + \sum b_{1i} b_{2k} N(T_i, T_k), \end{aligned}$$

$N(w_1, w_2)$ yields the bilinear form

$$\sum (a_{1i} b_{2i} - a_{2i} b_{1i}).$$

If S_i' and T_i' are another system of generators for the fundamental group, likewise associated with the paths of a second normal form, and if $\prod_i S_i'^{a'_{ki}} T_i'^{b'_{ki}}$ are the homology of the paths w_k, then we must have

$$\sum (a'_{1i} b'_{2i} - a'_{2i} b'_{1i}) = \sum (a_{1i} b_{2i} - a_{2i} b_{1i}).$$

Finally, here is one more application of the formula: if S_i, T_i, S_i', T_i' retain the same meaning in the factor group by the commutator group,

$$S_i' = \prod S_k^{\alpha_{ik}} \prod T_k^{\beta_{ik}}, \quad T_i' = \prod S_k^{\gamma_{ik}} \prod T_k^{\delta_{ik}},$$

then

$$N(S_i', T_i) = \alpha_{ii} \quad \text{and} \quad N(S_i, T_i') = \delta_{ii},$$

and hence

$$s = \sum \alpha_{ii} + \sum \delta_{ii},$$

the trace of the matrix by which the passage from S_i, T_i to S_i', T_i' takes place in the factor group, is equal to the intersection number

$$\sum N(S_i', T_i) + \sum N(S_i, T_i').$$

The investigation of the intersection points of closed paths may be greatly refined by dividing the intersection points into classes which depend only on the homotopy classes of the paths.[4]

[4] R. BAER, J. für reine und angew. Math. **156** (1927) 231.

6.6 One-sided and Two-sided Paths

In order to describe the properties of simple paths somewhat more precisely we introduce the concepts of "one-sided" and "two-sided" paths.

Let w be any simple closed path of the manifold $\mathfrak{M}$, which passes through the points $p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_n = p_0$ and the segments $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n$ in that order. New segments

$$s_{i1}, \quad s_{i2} \qquad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$$

may now be introduced and $\mathfrak{M}$ thereby extended to the manifolds $\mathfrak{M}_{i1}, \mathfrak{M}_{i2}$ in succession. The segments s_{i1}, s_{i2} begin at p_{i-1} and end at p_i, and if $s_i w_{i1}$ and if $s_i w_{i2}$ are the two boundary paths in $\mathfrak{M}_{i-1,2}$ beginning with s_i then new surface pieces may always be introduced with the boundary paths $s_i s_{i1}^{-1}$ and $s_i s_{i2}^{-1}$. It is assumed that the paths w_{i1}, w_{i2} do not run through the segment s_i. The path w is embedded in 2-gons in the new manifold $\mathfrak{M}_{n,2}$. The distribution of the second indices 1, 2 in the new manifold can be arranged in such a way that the ordering

$$s_{i1}, s_i, s_{i2}, \ldots, s_{i+1,2}^{-1}, s_{i+1}^{-1}, s_{i+1,1}^{-1}, \ldots \quad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$$

is obtained in the stars of the points p_i. But then the star of the point p_0 is completely determined and either has the ordering

$$s_{n1}, s_n, s_{n2}, \ldots, s_{12}^{-1}, s_1^{-1}, s_{11}^{-1}, \ldots$$

or else the ordering

$$s_{n2}, s_n, s_{n1}, \ldots, s_{12}^{-1}, s_1^{-1}, s_{11}^{-1}, \ldots.$$

In the first case we call the path *two-sided*, in the second case *one-sided*.

Because if we construct the path

$$w_k = s_{1k} s_{2k} \cdots s_{nk} \qquad (k = 1, 2)$$

then in the first case we always remain on the same side of w, intuitively speaking, while in the second case we go from one side of w to the other.

If a manifold possesses a one-sided path, then it is not orientable. For otherwise the stars of the points $p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_n$ could not be oriented as we did in Section 5.13. *On the other hand, one-sided and two-sided paths may always be given in nonorientable manifolds.*

We show that a singular segment that appears in a boundary path of the form $s^2 w$ is one-sided, whereas a segment that appears in the form $s t s t^{-1}$ is two-sided. Namely, we construct new manifolds by insertion of the segment s' and in the first case take $s' s^{-1}$ and $s' s w$ as new boundary paths; in the second case take $s' s^{-1}$ and $s t s' t^{-1}$ as new boundary paths. Then in the first case the cycle of segments beginning at the point of the normal form has the substar s^{-1}, s'^{-1}, s, so s' goes from one side of s to the other; in the second case it has the substar $s^{-1}, s'^{-1}, t^{-1}, s', s$, so s' remains on the same side of s. Thus we have obtained a geometric interpretation of the appearance of a segment in boundary paths of the two forms $s^2 w$ and $s t s t^{-1} w$, and *it is shown that the forms* 1a *and* 1b, *as well as the forms* 2a *and* 2b, *in Section* 5.12 *are not reducible to each other.*

One can define one-sided and two-sided quite analogously for non-simple paths and show that homotopic curves are always of the same type. Separating curves are obviously two-sided.

6.7 Simple Strips

The manifolds with the paths w, w_1, w_2, constructed in the previous section, may be subjected to the following extensions of the third kind: in place of each point p_i we take three points, with new segments t_{i1} connecting the boundary points p_{i1} and p_i, and t_{i2} connecting the boundary points p_{i2} and p_i. If

$$s_{i1}^{-1}, s_i^{-1}, s_{i2}^{-1}, s_{\alpha_{i1}}, s_{\alpha_{i2}}, \ldots, s_{\alpha_{ir}}, s_{i+1,2}, s_{i+1}, s_{i+1,1}, s_{\beta_{i1}}, s_{\beta_{i2}}, \ldots, s_{\beta_{il}}$$

is the star of segments through p_i, then

$$\begin{aligned} &s_{i1}^{-1}, s_{\beta_{il}}, \ldots, s_{\beta_{i1}}, s_{i+1,1}, t_{i1} \quad \text{becomes the star of } p_{i1},\\ &s_{i2}^{-1}, s_{\alpha_{i1}}, \ldots, s_{\alpha_{ir}}, s_{i+1,2}, t_{i2} \quad \text{becomes the star of } p_{i2},\\ &s_i^{-1}, t_{i1}^{-1}, s_{i+1}, t_{i2} \quad \text{becomes the star of } p_i. \end{aligned}$$

This converts w_1 and w_2 into two simple paths which terminate in the case of a two-sided path w and which result in a single simple closed path $w_1 w_2$ in the case of a one-side path w. The 2-gons around p_i have been converted into 4-gons. The complex of these quadrilaterals and their boundary elements is a manifold with boundary which may be called a *strip*. In the case of a one-sided path we get a strip convertible into a manifold which is a projective plane by insertion of a surface piece with the boundary path $w_1 w_2$. The strip is a MÖBIUS band. In the case of a two-sided path we get a strip convertible into a sphere by the addition of two surface pieces with the boundary paths w_i—a cylindrical band.

Conversely, if we remove from $\mathfrak{M}$ the points $p_0, \ldots, p_{n-1}$, the segments $s_1, \ldots, s_n$, t_{i1}, t_{i2}, and the quadrilaterals of the strip then, in the case where w does not separate $\mathfrak{M}$, $\mathfrak{M}$ is converted into a manifold with boundary, $\mathfrak{R}$, which can be converted into a manifold $\mathfrak{M}'$ without boundary by the addition of one or two surface pieces with the boundary paths $w_1 w_2$ and w_i respectively. Otherwise, i.e. when w separates $\mathfrak{M}$, $\mathfrak{M}$ breaks into two manifolds with boundary, $\mathfrak{R}_1$ and $\mathfrak{R}_2$.

In the case of non-separating cuts w on non-orientable manifolds one can further distinguish between *two types of non-separating cuts*, according as *the manifold resulting from $\mathfrak{M}$ from the cut along w is orientable or not.* One is easily convinced that this property enables us to distinguish between simple paths which may be embedded in a boundary path of the types 1a, b of Section 5.12, and those for which this is not possible and which consequently reduce to the types 2a, b of Section 5.12. For when one cuts a manifold with a boundary path of type 1a,b along s the result is an orientable manifold, whereas a boundary path of type 2a,b results in a non-orientable manifold. Consequently, *we have now shown that the four types of boundary path realized by non-orientable manifolds in Section 5.12 are not reducible to each other.*

6.8 Normal Forms and Fundamental Groups

The preceding section showed that the group elements $[w]$ corresponding to simple indecomposable curves w constitute a special class. It is natural to ask how all the elements of this class are determined. As Section 6.4 shows, this question is closely related to another. *Let $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_g$ be closed curves emanating from a point p, which pass into g singular segments of a normal polygon under suitable reduction of the manifold. The $[w_i]$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, g)$ are a special g-tuple of group elements*, and the question is how to obtain them. They certainly constitute a system of generators. We can formulate our question precisely as: *if $[w_i]$ and $[w_i']$ are two such g-tuples, how may the $[w_i']$ be expressed in terms of the $[w_i]$?* [5]

Now by Section 5.9 the reduction of a manifold to normal form is established by giving two compatible trees $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{B}'$ which contain all points of $\mathfrak{M}$ and its dual manifold respectively. So let $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{B}'$ be a pair for which the $[w_i]$ go into the singular segments of the normal form and let $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}, \overline{\mathfrak{B}}'$ be a pair for which this happens to the $[w_i']$. The group elements $[w_i]^{\pm 1}$ and $[w_i']^{\pm 1}$ are determined up to numbering these tree pairs, and for that reason we first investigate the meaning of our question with regard to these tree pairs.

We can embed $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{B}}$ in a *chain of neighboring trees* in $\mathfrak{M}$

$$\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{B}_1, \mathfrak{B}_2, \ldots, \mathfrak{B}_n = \overline{\mathfrak{B}}$$

which contain all the points of $\mathfrak{M}$. For each $\mathfrak{B}_i$ there is therefore a compatible $\mathfrak{B}_i'$ which contains all the points of $\mathfrak{M}'$. One also sees immediately that two trees $\mathfrak{B}_{i1}'$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{ik}'$ compatible with $\mathfrak{B}_i$ may be embedded in a chain of compatible trees $\mathfrak{B}_{i2}', \ldots, \mathfrak{B}_{i,k-1}'$. Finally, if $\mathfrak{B}_i$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}$ are two neighboring trees then there is either a tree $\mathfrak{B}_i'$ compatible with both $\mathfrak{B}_i$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}$, or else two neighboring trees $\mathfrak{B}_i'$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}'$ compatible with $\mathfrak{B}_i$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}$ respectively. Namely, if s_{i+1} is the segment that appears in $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}$ but not in $\mathfrak{B}_i$, and if w_i is a simple path which connects the boundary points of s_{i+1} in $\mathfrak{B}_i$, and hence passes through the segment s_i which appears in $\mathfrak{B}_i$ but not in $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}$, then either the path $s_{i+1} w_i$ separates $\mathfrak{M}$ or not. In the first case there is a tree compatible with $\mathfrak{B}_i'$ as well as with $\mathfrak{B}_i$. In the second case each tree $\mathfrak{B}_i'$ compatible with $\mathfrak{B}_i$ contains the segment s_{i+1}' corresponding to s_{i+1}. Now if one replaces s_{i+1}' by the segment s_i' dual to s_i then a tree $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}'$ neighboring $\mathfrak{B}_i'$ and compatible with $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}$ results from $\mathfrak{B}_i'$.

6.9 Manifolds with Two Surface Pieces and Two Points

We now focus on the case where there are two neighboring trees $\mathfrak{B}_i, \mathfrak{B}_{i+1}$ for which there is no tree $\mathfrak{B}'$ compatible with both. In this case *the manifold may be altered by elementary transformations in such a way that there is a tree $\mathfrak{B}_{i,i+1}$ in the new manifold $\mathfrak{M}^*$, neighboring both $\mathfrak{B}_i$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}$, and in the dual manifold of $\mathfrak{M}^*$ there are trees $\mathfrak{B}_i^{*\prime}$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}^{*\prime}$ compatible with $\mathfrak{B}_i$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{i,i+1}$ on the one hand, and with $\mathfrak{B}_{i,i+1}$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}$ on the other.*

[5] K. REIDEMEISTER, J. für reine und angew. Math. Henselschrift (1932).

If $\mathfrak{B}'_i$ and $\mathfrak{B}'_{i+1}$ are two neighboring trees compatible with $\mathfrak{B}_i$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}$ respectively, then we remove by reduction all segments which appear in $\mathfrak{B}_i$ as well as in $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}$, and all which correspond to those appearing in $\mathfrak{B}'_i$ as well as in $\mathfrak{B}'_{i+1}$. In this way $\mathfrak{M}$ is converted into a manifold with two surface pieces f_1, f_2 and two points p_1, p_2 and trees consisting of single segments. The one appearing in $\mathfrak{B}_i$ is called s_i and the one appearing in $\mathfrak{B}_{i+1}$ is called s_{i+1}. Then the segment in $\mathfrak{B}'_i$ is the dual to s_{i+1} and the segment in $\mathfrak{B}'_{i+1}$ is the dual to s_i. If r_1, r_2 are simple boundary paths of f_1, f_2 then

$$r_1 = s_i r_{11} s_{i+1}^{\varepsilon_1} r_{12}, \quad r_2 = s_i r_{21} s_{i+1}^{\varepsilon_2} r_{22}.$$

Here r_{11}, r_{12} together pass through each segment either twice or not at all. The same holds for r_{21} and r_{22}. Otherwise the closed path $s_i s_{i+1}^{-1}$ (s_i and s_{i+1} each run from p_1 to p_2) would not separate the manifold.

Now, on the one hand, all segments apart from s_i and s_{i+1} could be singular. Then either the segment s_α following s_i in r_1 is singular or the last segment s_β of r_1 is singular (otherwise we would have $s_\alpha = s_\beta = s_{i+1}^{\varepsilon_1}$). If, say, s_α is singular it begins at p_1 and we divide f_1 into f_{11} and f_{12} by introducing the segment t with boundary points p_1 and p_2. And when $r_1 = s_i s_\alpha r_3$ we take $r_{11} = t\, r_3$ as the boundary path of f_{11} and $r_{12} = s_i s_\alpha t^{-1}$ as the boundary path of f_{12}. Then the path $t\, s_{i+1}^{-1}$ does not separate the manifold. For f_{11} and f_{12} meet along s_α and f_{11} and f_2 meet along s_i. The tree consisting of the single segment t therefore satisfies the required conditions. We proceed quite analogously when $s_\alpha = s_{i+1}^{\varepsilon_1}$ and s_β is singular.

If, on the other hand, there is another regular segment s_γ, apart from s_i and s_{i+1}, that goes from p_1 to p_2, then the tree consisting of the segment s_γ satisfies our conditions. For the paths $s_\gamma s_i^{-1}$ and $s_\gamma s_{i+1}^{-1}$ do not separate the manifold.

6.10 Elementary Relatedness and Isomorphism

In order to be able to precisely express the results of the previous sections we introduce, by analogy with the concept of a "neighboring normal polygon" in Section 5.10 ("normal polygon" is the same as "normal form of a manifold"), the concept of "dually neighboring normal polygons":

Two normal polygons are called *dually neighboring* if they are convertible into each other by an extension and subsequent reduction of the third kind.

Then our result reads as follows:

Let $\mathfrak{N}$ and $\mathfrak{N}'$ be two normal polygons, and let

$$\mathfrak{N} = \mathfrak{M}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathfrak{M}^{(n)}, \mathfrak{M}^{(n+1)}, \ldots, \mathfrak{M}^{(m)} = \mathfrak{N}'$$

be a chain of manifolds, where $\mathfrak{M}^{(i)}$ results from $\mathfrak{M}^{(i-1)}$ by an elementary subdivision for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ and by an elementary reduction for $i = n+1, \ldots, m$. Let $\boldsymbol{I}([w]) = [w]'$ be the induced isomorphism between the groups of $\mathfrak{N}$ and $\mathfrak{N}'$. Then there is a chain of normal polygons

$$\mathfrak{N} = \mathfrak{N}^{(1)}, \mathfrak{N}^{(2)}, \ldots, \mathfrak{N}^{(m)} = \mathfrak{N}'$$

of which any two in succession are neighboring or dually neighboring, and the isomorphism $\boldsymbol{I}'([w])$ induced by this chain is identical with $\boldsymbol{I}([w])$.

Now let $s_1^{(i)\pm 1}, s_2^{(i)\pm 1}, \ldots, s_g^{(i)\pm 1}$ be the $2g$ segments which appear in $\mathfrak{N}^{(i)}$, let $S_1^{(i)\pm 1}$, $S_2^{(i)\pm 1}$, …, $S_g^{(i)\pm 1}$ be the corresponding group elements, let $\boldsymbol{I}_i$ be the isomorphism between $\mathfrak{N}^{(i)}$ and $\mathfrak{N}^{(i+1)}$ determined by Section 6.2, and in fact let

$$T_i^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{I}_i(S_k^{(i+1)}).$$

Then the elements $T_i^{(k)}$ may be expressed in terms of the $S_l^{(i)}$ in such a way that these power products are a system of free generators for the free group determined by the $S_l^{(i)}$. If $\mathfrak{N}^{(i)}$ and $\mathfrak{N}^{(i+1)}$ are neighbors this follows from the formulas given in Section 6.2. If they are dually neighboring one notes that the connection number of the line segment complex is preserved when the transition complex has two points and one surface piece. The assertion then follows from the facts on exchange of generators proved in Section 4.6.

But then the analogous result follows for arbitrary elementarily related normal forms. If $\boldsymbol{I}$ is the isomorphism between the fundamental groups of $\mathfrak{N}^{(1)}$ and $\mathfrak{N}^{(n)}$ determined by $T_k^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{I}(S_k^{(n)})$ then the $T_k^{(1)}$ may be expressed as power products in the $S_k^{(1)}$ in such a way that these products constitute a system of free generators of the free group determined by the $S_k^{(1)}$.

There remains the problem of making the system of generators $T_k^{(1)}$ obtained in this way more easily visualizable. For this purpose we refine the previous result by the following theorem.

If $\mathfrak{N}$ and $\mathfrak{N}'$ are two dually neighboring normal polygons then there is a chain

$$\mathfrak{N}^{(1)} = \mathfrak{N}, \mathfrak{N}^{(2)}, \ldots, \mathfrak{N}^{(n)} = \mathfrak{N}'$$

of neighboring normal polygons which establishes the same isomorphism between the groups of $\mathfrak{N}$ and $\mathfrak{N}'$ as that induced by the original transformation.

Certainly there is a chain $\mathfrak{N}^{(1)} = \mathfrak{N}, \mathfrak{N}^{(2)}, \ldots, \mathfrak{N}^{(n)} = \mathfrak{N}'$ of dually neighboring normal polygons in which the passage from $\mathfrak{N}^{(i)}$ to $\mathfrak{N}^{(i+1)}$ is effected by a complex in which the newly introduced, and then eliminated, point bounds exactly three line segments. The dual situation has already been dealt with in Section 5.10. I claim that $\mathfrak{N}^{(i)}$ and $\mathfrak{N}^{(i+1)}$ are then neighboring also.

To prove this we consider the complex of a single surface piece f and two points p_1, p_2 that accomplishes the transition. Let s_i, s_{i+1}^{-1}, and s_1 be the three segments that go from p_1 to p_2; $\mathfrak{N}^{(i)}$ and $\mathfrak{N}^{(i+1)}$ result from reduction of s_i and s_{i+1} respectively. The boundary path of f runs over p_2 three times and contains the subpaths $s_i s_1^{-1}$, $s_1 s_{i+1}$ or $s_{i+1}^{-1} s_1^{-1}$, $s_i s_{i+1}$ or $s_{i+1}^{-1} s_i^{-1}$. Say

$$r = s_i s_1^{-1} r_1 s_1 s_{i+1} r_2 s_i s_{i+1} r_3.$$

Then the boundary path remaining in $\mathfrak{N}^{(i)}$ is

$$r^{(i)} = s_1^{-1} r_1 s_1 s_{i+1} r_2 s_{i+1} r_3,$$

and in $\mathfrak{N}^{i+1}$

$$r^{(i+1)} = s_i s_1^{-1} r_1 s_1 r_2 s_i r_3.$$

If we now construct the triangle $s_i s_1^{-1} t$ and eliminate s_1, then the boundary path

$$t^{-1} r_1 t s_i r_2 s_i r_3$$

results from $\mathfrak{N}^{(i+1)}$. But apart from notation ($t \sim s$, $s_{i+1} \sim s_i$) this is identical with the boundary path of $\mathfrak{N}^{(i)}$.

Further, in both transformations of $\mathfrak{N}^{(i)}$ into $\mathfrak{N}^{(i+1)}$ the same isomorphism between their groups takes place.

One can describe the connection between the two transformations intuitively by saying that in one case one lets the endpoint of the segment s_1 slide along the segment s_i, respectively s_{i+1}, while in the second case one constructs a triangle from the initial and final positions and the segment s_i, respectively s_{i+1}, across which the transition from the initial to final position is carried out.

The passage between two neighboring normal polygons can finally be carried out by a chain of extensions and reductions in which each newly introduced, and then eliminated, surface piece is a triangle. If we call these alterations triangle transformations then we have the theorem:

If $\mathfrak{N}$ and $\mathfrak{N}'$ are two elementarily related normal polygons and if $\boldsymbol{I}$ is the isomorphism induced between the groups of $\mathfrak{N}$ and $\mathfrak{N}'$ by the elementary transformation of $\mathfrak{N}$ into $\mathfrak{N}'$, then the same isomorphism may be effected by a chain

$$\mathfrak{N} = \mathfrak{N}^{(1)}, \mathfrak{N}^{(2)}, \ldots, \mathfrak{N}^{(n)} = \mathfrak{N}',$$

where $\mathfrak{N}^{(i)}$ results from $\mathfrak{N}^{(i-1)}$ by a triangle transformation.

6.11 Some Problems

Using the results of the preceding section we may derive a method for presenting generators for the groups of automorphisms of the fundamental group which result from elementary transformations and mappings of isomorphic manifolds (cf. Section 6.12). The exchange of generators in the fundamental group due to elementary modifications of the normal form yields all automorphisms immediately in the case of the torus, because the torus has only the canonical form as normal form; however this is not the case for surfaces of higher genus, because they always have different normal forms which are elementarily related but not isomorphic to to each other. Further, the exchanges of generators induced by elementary transformations in this case constitute a groupoid (Section 1.15), the identities of which correspond to the different normal forms of the surface. By the final result of Section 6.10 one can take the transformations

$$S_i' = S_i \quad (i \neq a), \qquad S_a' = S_a S_b^{\pm 1} \quad \text{or} \quad S_a' = S_b^{\pm 1} S_a$$

as generators of this groupoid, corresponding to the modifications which convert one normal form into another.

Incidentally, one sees that the automorphism group of the torus determined by elementary transformations is identical with the automorphism group of the free

commutative group on two generators. The analogous theorem has been proved by DEHN and NIELSEN[6] for the groups of the remaining orientable manifolds.[7]

The automorphism group for $p = 2$ has been determined by BAER[8] in a way different from that sketched here.

Conversely, one can ask to what extent the elementary transformations are characterized by the induced isomorphisms of the fundamental group. To make this question precise we remark that: by TIETZE we can subdivide two elementarily related manifolds so that two isomorphic subcomplexes result. More precisely, the following holds: if $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{M}'$ are two manifolds resulting from each other by a chain of extensions and reductions, then one can arrange the transition in such a way that first only extensions appear, and then only reductions, while the isomorphisms of the fundamental group induced by both chains are the same.[9] Now if $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{M}'$ are canonical normal forms ($\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{M}'$ are then isomorphic), and $\mathfrak{M}^*$ is the manifold in the chain that contains the most elements, w_i and w_i' $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, q)$ are the paths in $\mathfrak{M}^*$ corresponding to the segments s_i and s_i' of $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{M}'$, and if the induced automorphism is induced is inner, what is the relation between the paths w_i and w_i'?

One would conjecture a theorem corresponding to one of BAER[10] concerning continuous manifolds, that the w_i may be deformed into w_i' in $\mathfrak{M}^*$ or a subdivision of $\mathfrak{M}^*$ in such a way that in each intermediate position $\overline{w}_i$ there is always a system of simple paths meeting in only one point. In connection with this there is the still unproved combinatorial theorem: simple homotopic paths are always "isotopic,"[11] i.e., with suitable subdivision of the initial manifold they may always be transformed into one another in such a way that the intermediate positions are also simple paths.

On the basis of these results one can see that the elementary transformations by which one manifold is converted to another, isomorphic to it, and which therefore induce automorphisms in the fundamental group may be classified quite analogously to the continuous mappings of continuous manifolds.

One may compare these questions with the determination of simple paths on a manifold by DEHN and BAER, which, as stated at the beginning of Section 6.8, is connected with the determination of the automorphism group.

---

[6] J. NIELSEN, Acta. Math. **50**, (1927), 191.

[7] Reidemeister here describes the relation between homeomorphic mappings of a surface and automorphisms of its fundamental group rather loosely. To be more precise, the surface mappings should be taken modulo isotopy and the automorphisms should be taken modulo inner automorphisms. (Note that the fundamental group of the torus is abelian, so its inner automorphism group is trivial.) Then the Dehn-Nielsen-Baer theorem states that the group of homeomorphisms modulo isotopy is isomorphic to the group of automorphisms of the fundamental group modulo inner automorphisms. (Translator's note.)

[8] R. BAER, J. für reine und angew. Math. **160** (1928), 1.

[9] H. TIETZE Mon. f. Math. u. Phys. Jahrg. 19, p.1 and E. BILTZ, Math. Zeitschr. **18** (1923), 1.

[10] R. BAER, J. für reine und angew. Math. **159** (1928), 101.

[11] R. BAER, J. für reine und angew. Math. **159** (1928), 101.

6.12 Coverings of Surface Complexes

Coverings of surface complexes may be defined similarly to those for line segment complexes, and the basic theorems are likewise obtained as they were earlier.

If $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{F}^*$ are two surface complexes we say that $\mathfrak{F}$ covers $\mathfrak{F}^*$ when there is a mapping $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{F}^*$ of the points, line segments, and surface pieces of $\mathfrak{F}$ onto those of $\mathfrak{F}^*$ satisfying the following conditions.

A.1. *If $\mathfrak{C}$ is the line segment complex contained in $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\mathfrak{C}^*$ is that contained in $\mathfrak{F}^*$, then the mapping $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$ is a covering of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ by $\mathfrak{C}$, which satisfies the conditions of Section 4.17.*

A.2. *For each surface piece f of $\mathfrak{F}$ there is a well-defined surface piece $\boldsymbol{A}(f) = f^*$, and $\boldsymbol{A}(f^{-1}) = (\boldsymbol{A}(f))^{-1}$.*

For the sake of convenience, before we formulate the last condition we will suppose that in $\mathfrak{F}^*$ each simple positive boundary path w of a surface piece f^* bounds only this one surface piece positively.

A.3. *If r is a simple positive boundary path of the surface piece f of $\mathfrak{F}$ then $\boldsymbol{A}(r) = r^*$ is a simple positive boundary path of $\boldsymbol{A}(f)$. If w' is any path of $\mathfrak{F}$ for which $\boldsymbol{A}(w') = r^*$, where r^* is a boundary path of f^*, then there is also a surface piece f' in $\mathfrak{F}$ of which w' is a simple positive boundary path and for which $\boldsymbol{A}(f') = f^*$.*

$\mathfrak{F}$ is called homomorphic to $\mathfrak{F}^*$ when there is a covering $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{F}^*$. Homomorphism is transitive. If $\mathfrak{F}, \mathfrak{F}^*, \mathfrak{F}^{**}$ are three surface complexes and if $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{F}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{F}^*) = \mathfrak{F}^{**}$ are coverings of $\mathfrak{F}^*$ and $\mathfrak{F}^{**}$ by $\mathfrak{F}^*$, then

$$\boldsymbol{A}''(\mathfrak{F}) = \boldsymbol{A}'(\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{F})) = \mathfrak{F}^{**}$$

is the mapping of $\mathfrak{F}$ onto $\mathfrak{F}^{**}$ obtained via $\boldsymbol{A}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}'$. Then the line segment complex of $\mathfrak{F}$ covers that of $\mathfrak{F}^{**}$, each f^{**} corresponds to an f, and $\boldsymbol{A}''(f^{-1}) = (\boldsymbol{A}''(f))^{-1}$. Finally, if w^{**} is any simple boundary path of a simple surface piece f^{**}, and $\boldsymbol{A}''(w) = \boldsymbol{A}'(w^*) = w^{**}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}(w) = w^*$, then w^* is a simple positive boundary path of the surface piece f^* with $\boldsymbol{A}(f) = f^*$ and w is a simple positive boundary path of the surface piece f with $\boldsymbol{A}(f) = f^*$ and $\boldsymbol{A}''(f) = f^{**}$.

6.13 Coverings of Line Segment and Surface Complexes

One can immediately survey those coverings of a line segment complex $\mathfrak{C}^*$ by $\mathfrak{C}$ that are extendible to a covering of the surface complex $\mathfrak{F}^*$ by $\mathfrak{F}$. *It is necessary and sufficient that in the covering*

$$\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$$

all paths w that lie over simple boundary paths of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ are closed. It is necessary by A.3 in Section 6.1 because the boundary path of a surface piece is always closed; it is sufficient because a line segment complex $\mathfrak{C}$ which covers $\mathfrak{C}^*$ in the way described may be immediately extended to a surface complex $\mathfrak{F}$ which covers $\mathfrak{F}^*$. Namely, if $f_1^{*\pm 1}, f_2^{*\pm 1}, \ldots$ are the surface pieces of $\mathfrak{F}^*$, $r_i^{*\pm 1}$ is a simple positive boundary path of $f_i^{*\pm 1}$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots)$, and if $r_{i1}, r_{i2}, \ldots$ are the paths in $\mathfrak{C}$ over r_i^*, then we add the surface pieces $f_{i1}^{\pm 1}, f_{i2}^{\pm 1} \ldots$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots)$ to $\mathfrak{C}$ and define r_{ik} to be a simple positive boundary path of f_{ik}. The complex $\mathfrak{F}$ consisting of $\mathfrak{C}$ and the $f_{ik}^{\pm 1}$ then covers $\mathfrak{F}^*$.

For if r is any path which lies over a simple boundary path r^*, $\boldsymbol{A}(r) = r^*$, then r is also a simple boundary path. This is because, by Section 4.8, r results from cyclic interchange in one of the paths $r_{ik}^{\pm 1}$ over $r_i^{*\pm 1}$. Thus r bounds at least one surface piece f.

It is possible that r bounds several surface pieces $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_n$; namely, when there are n different cyclic interchanges $r^{(1)}, r^{(2)}, \ldots, r^{(n)}$ of r for which $\boldsymbol{A}(r^{(i)}) = r^{*\varepsilon_i}$ ($\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$). In this case it can happen, e.g., that r bounds exactly two different surface pieces f_{11} and f_{12} for which $\boldsymbol{A}(f_{11}) = \boldsymbol{A}(f_{12})$; namely, when there are two cyclic interchanges $r^{(11)}$ and $r^{(12)}$ of r, for which $\boldsymbol{A}(r^{(11)}) = \boldsymbol{A}(r^{(12)})$. $\boldsymbol{A}(r^{(11)}) = r^{(11)^*}$ must then be carried into itself by a cyclic transformation; i.e., we must have $r^{(11)^*} = w^* w^*$.

We will replace the condition just found for extendibility of a covering of a line segment complex $\mathfrak{C}^*$ to one of a surface complex $\mathfrak{F}^*$ by a condition on the permutations associated with each covering of a line segment complex $\mathfrak{C}^*$ by $\mathfrak{C}$ (Section 4.10). Let $\mathfrak{B}^*$ be any spanning tree of $\mathfrak{C}^*$, let $s_1^{*\pm 1}, s_2^{*\pm 1}, \ldots$ be the segments of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ that do not appear in $\mathfrak{B}^*$, let $\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots$ be the corresponding permutations, and let $S_1, S_2, \ldots$ be the corresponding generators of the fundamental group of $\mathfrak{C}^*$. Further, let $r_1^*, r_2^*, \ldots$ be all the simple boundary paths of surface pieces of $\mathfrak{C}^*$. Then the permutations corresponding to these paths r_i^* must all be the identity permutation. Thus, by Section 4.16, the π_i must satisfy the relations of the fundamental group of the surface complex. Thus the group generated by the π_i is a representation of the fundamental group $\mathfrak{W}$ of $\mathfrak{F}^*$. Conversely, each such permutation group may be associated with a line segment complex $\mathfrak{C}$ with $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$ and hence also with a surface complex $\mathfrak{F}$ with $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{F}^*$.

6.14 The Fundamental Group of the Covering Complex

Under the hypotheses of the previous section it is clear from Section 4.17 that the group of the closed paths in $\mathfrak{C}$ beginning at p is homomorphic to a subgroup of the group of closed paths in $\mathfrak{C}^*$ beginning at $\boldsymbol{A}(p) = p^*$. We now also assert:

The group $\mathfrak{W}$ of classes of closed paths in the surface complex $\mathfrak{F}$ beginning at p is isomorphic to a subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ of the group $\mathfrak{W}^*$ of closed paths in the surface complex $\mathfrak{F}^*$ beginning at $\boldsymbol{A}(p) = p^*$.

If w is a closed path beginning at p and $\boldsymbol{A}(w) = w^*$, then $[w], [w^*]$ respectively are the elements of the groups $\mathfrak{W}, \mathfrak{W}^*$ to which w, w^* respectively belong, then we define the mapping $\boldsymbol{I}$ by

$$\boldsymbol{I}([w]) = [w^*] = [\boldsymbol{A}(w)]$$

and claim that $\boldsymbol{I}$ maps $\mathfrak{W}$ one-to-one onto a subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ of $\mathfrak{W}^*$. Since

$$[w^{-1}] = [w]^{-1}, \quad [\boldsymbol{A}(w^{-1})] = [\boldsymbol{A}(w)]^{-1},$$

and since also

$$[w_1][w_2] = [w_1 w_2] \quad \text{and} \quad [\boldsymbol{A}(w_1)][\boldsymbol{A}(w_2)] = [\boldsymbol{A}(w_1 w_2)],$$

we have only to prove one-to-oneness; i.e., to show that if w_1 and w_2 are two closed paths beginning at p and $[w_1] = [w_2]$ then $[\boldsymbol{A}(w_1)] = [\boldsymbol{A}(w_2)]$; and conversely, if

w_1^*, w_2^* are two closed paths beginning at p^* and if w_1, w_2 are two beginning at p, likewise closed, for which

$$\boldsymbol{A}(w_i) = w_i^* \quad (i = 1,2)$$

and if $[w_1^*] = [w_2^*]$, then $[w_1] = [w_2]$ also.

But that comes down to showing: if $[w]$ is the identity element of $\mathfrak{W}$ then $[\boldsymbol{A}(w)]$ is the identity element of $\mathfrak{U}$, and conversely, if $[\boldsymbol{A}(w)]$ is the identity element of $\mathfrak{U}$ then $[w]$ is the identity element of $\mathfrak{W}$. Now if $[w]$ is the identity element then w may be altered by elementary extensions and reductions until it consists of subpaths of the form $w' r w'^{-1}$, which likewise begin and end at p and for which each r is a simple boundary path in $\mathfrak{F}$. But then

$$\boldsymbol{A}(w' r w'^{-1}) = \boldsymbol{A}(w')\boldsymbol{A}(r)\boldsymbol{A}(w'^{-1})$$

and $\boldsymbol{A}(r)$ is likewise a simple boundary path in $\mathfrak{F}^*$, so $[\boldsymbol{A}(w' r w'^{-1})]$ is the identity element of $\mathfrak{W}^*$. The first part of the claim follows from this. And, since r is a boundary path in $\mathfrak{F}$ when $\boldsymbol{A}(r) = r^*$ is a boundary path in $\mathfrak{F}^*$, the converse part of the claim also follows.

If $\mathfrak{F}$ is connected then each point p_i for which $\boldsymbol{A}(p_i) = p^*$ may be connected to $p = p_0$. The collection of paths from p to p_i then corresponds to a residue class $\mathfrak{U}G$ in the group $\mathfrak{W}^*$ of the complex $\mathfrak{F}^*$. The corresponding permutations stand in the same relation to the residue classes as was described in Section 4.17. Likewise in analogy with Section 4.17, a covering of $\mathfrak{F}^*$ by $\mathfrak{F}$ may be constructed for each subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ of $\mathfrak{W}^*$.

One can imagine applying the process for determining generators and relations of subgroups to these surface complexes. A system of paths w_i from p_0 to the p_i yields a complete system of representatives G_i for the residue classes $\mathfrak{U}G$ modulo $\mathfrak{U}$ in $\mathfrak{W}^*$. The w_i constitute a tree when the G_i satisfy the SCHREIER condition (Σ) of Section 3.6. The boundary paths of the surface pieces f_i lying over the same surface piece f^* yield the relations $G_i R G_i^{-1}$ when R is the relation corresponding to f^*. The free group determined by the generators $U_{G,S}$ of Section 3.7 is the fundamental group of the line segment complex $\mathfrak{C}$ associated with p_0. Now one has everything needed to follow the proofs of the theorems of Section 3.7 step by step for surface complexes.

The invariance of the surface complex group under elementary transformations corresponds here to the theorem: if $\mathfrak{F}^*$ and $\mathfrak{F}^{*\prime}$ are two elementarily related surface complexes, and if $\mathfrak{F}$ covers $\mathfrak{F}^*$, then there is a well-defined surface complex $\mathfrak{F}'$, elementarily related to $\mathfrak{F}$, which covers $\mathfrak{F}^{*\prime}$.

6.15 Regular Coverings

If we take $\mathfrak{U}$ to be an invariant subgroup of $\mathfrak{W}^*$ then $\mathfrak{C}$ covers the complex $\mathfrak{C}^*$ regularly, and conversely. In this case one sees that the transformations of $\mathfrak{C}$ constructed in Section 4.20 may be extended to *transformations of the surface complex $\mathfrak{F}$ into itself*. Namely, if r is a simple boundary path in $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}(r) = r^*$ is a simple boundary

path in $\mathfrak{F}^*$ that we associate uniquely with the surface piece f^*, then there is exactly one surface piece f, simply bounded by r, for which $\boldsymbol{A}(f) = f^*$; and if r goes to $\boldsymbol{I}(r) = r'$ by a mapping of $\mathfrak{C}$ into itself, then $\boldsymbol{A}(r) = \boldsymbol{A}(r')$ and hence r' is also a boundary path of a well-defined surface piece f' for which $\boldsymbol{A}(f') = f^*$. If $\boldsymbol{I}(f) = f'$, then $\boldsymbol{I}(f^{-1}) = f'^{-1}$, so $\boldsymbol{I}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{F}^*$ is in fact a mapping of $\mathfrak{F}$ onto itself that satisfies conditions A.1 to A.3 of Section 6.12. Each surface piece f goes to a surface piece f' for which $\boldsymbol{A}(f) = \boldsymbol{A}(f')$ under all these mappings, but not necessarily in the same way.

According to Section 6.13 it can happen that a boundary path r in $\mathfrak{F}$ bounds two different surface pieces f_1 and f_2 with $\boldsymbol{A}(f_1) = \boldsymbol{A}(f_2)$. Then r goes to itself under a transformation $\boldsymbol{I}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{F}$. An example is afforded by the complex $\mathfrak{F}^*$ consisting of a single surface piece, one point, and a segment with $w = s^* s^*$ as simple boundary path. The latter is covered by a complex of two surface pieces, two points, and two segments with the simple boundary path $s_1 s_2$ for both f_1 and f_2.

The connected complex $\mathfrak{F}$ that covers $\mathfrak{F}^*$ and corresponds as described to the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ of $\mathfrak{W}^*$ consisting only of the identity element is called the *universal covering complex*. If $\mathfrak{F}'$ is an arbitrary connected covering complex of $\mathfrak{F}^*$ then there is always a covering $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{F}'$ of $\mathfrak{F}'$ by the universal covering complex. If w is a closed path in $\mathfrak{F}$ and $\boldsymbol{A}(w) = w^*$ is the path corresponding to it, then $[w^*]$ is the identity element of the group $\mathfrak{W}^*$ of the complex $\mathfrak{F}^*$. If $\mathfrak{F}^*$ contains only one point, then the line segment complex contained in $\mathfrak{F}$ is the group diagram of $\mathfrak{W}^*$ in the generators $[s_i^*]$ that correspond to the segments s_i^* of $\mathfrak{F}^*$.

6.16 Coverings of Manifolds

We now assume that the covered complex $\mathfrak{F}^*$ is a manifold. We can apply the considerations of the previous sections when $\mathfrak{M}^*$ contains no simple boundary path r^* bounding two surface pieces f_1^* and $f_2^* \neq f_1^{*\pm 1}$. In this exceptional case $\mathfrak{M}^*$ is just a sphere. The path r^* runs through each of its segments s^* only once. Either there is only one such segment, and $\mathfrak{M}^*$ is in fact a sphere, or there are various such segments and $r^* = s^* r^{*\prime}$. Then we combine f_1^* and f_2^* into a surface piece f^* with the boundary path $r^{*\prime} r^{*\prime -1}$. Then one easily sees, by Section 5.3, that $r^{*\prime}$ is a simple path and hence $\mathfrak{M}^*$ is a sphere. Since a covering of the sphere by the sphere is the identity—because the fundamental group is the identity—we can now assume that each simple boundary path r^* of $\mathfrak{F}^*$ bounds only one surface piece $f^{*\pm 1}$. The most important theorem, which we will prove, reads:

If $\mathfrak{F}$ is a connected covering of a manifold $\mathfrak{M}^*$,

$$\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{M}^*,$$

then $\mathfrak{F}$ is itself a manifold.

First we have to show that a segment s of $\mathfrak{F}$ either appears twice in the boundary path of some surface piece and in no other boundary, or else s appears once in the boundary of exactly two surface pieces. Let $\boldsymbol{A}(s) = s^*$. If $s^* r_1^*$ and $s^* r_2^*$ are the two boundary paths of $\mathfrak{M}^*$ beginning with s^* and if

$$r_1^* \neq r_2^*, \tag{1}$$

then there are also two different paths sr_i with

$$\boldsymbol{A}(sr_i) = s^* r_i^* \qquad (i = 1,2)$$

and each simple boundary path sr that begins with s is either sr_1 or sr_2. Now either $s^* r_i^*$ runs through the segment s^* only once, and consequently bounds two different surface pieces f_1^* and f_2^*, so that sr_i likewise runs through the segment s only once and s bounds two different surface pieces f_{11} and f_{12} with $\boldsymbol{A}(f_{1i}) = f_i^*$; or else $s^* r_1^*$ runs through s^* twice, so that $s^* r_i^*$ are boundary paths of the same surface piece f^*. Then either sr_1 runs through s only once; in which case sr_1 and sr_2 are distinct paths, not convertible to each other by cyclic interchange or reversal, and hence they bound distinct surface pieces f_1 and f_2 with $\boldsymbol{A}(f_i) = f^*$ $(i = 1,2)$; or else sr_1 runs through s twice, in which case sr_2 is a cyclic interchange of $(sr_1)^\varepsilon$ $(\varepsilon = \pm 1)$ and the sr_i are therefore simple boundary paths of the same surface piece f.

In each of these cases only a single surface piece is spanned by the boundary path sr_i. For $s^* r_i^*$ certainly cannot be put in the form w^{*k}. Only $k = 2$ comes into question, but then

$$s^* r_i^* = s^* r_{11} s^* r_{11},$$

which is excluded by $r_1^* \neq r_2^*$. So if $r_1^* \neq r_2^*$ the assertion is proved.

Now let

$$r_1^* = r_2^*. \tag{2}$$

Then $s^* r_1^*$ must run through the segment s^* twice, so that either

$$s^* r_1^* = s^* w_1^* s^{*-1} w_2^*$$

and hence

$$s^* r_2^* = s^* w_1^{*-1} s^{*-1} w_2^{*-1},$$

so that

$$w_i^* = w_i^{*-1}$$

is the empty path, which means

$$s^* r_1^* = s^* s^{*-1}$$

and $\mathfrak{M}^*$ is the sphere, or else

$$s^* r_1^* = s^* w_1^* s^* w_2^*$$
$$s^* r_2^* = s^* w_2^* s^* w_1^*$$

and $w_1^* = w_2^* = w^*$. Here $s^* w^*$ runs through each segment of $\mathfrak{M}^*$ exactly once. Now either $sr_1 = sr_2$ runs through s, and hence each other segment, twice, in which case $\mathfrak{F}$ is identical with $\mathfrak{M}^*$; or else $sr_1 = sr_2$ runs through s only once, in which case there are exactly two segments s_{i1}, s_{i2} over each segment s_i^* of $\mathfrak{M}^*$ and two surface pieces f_1 and f_2 over the one surface piece f^* of $\mathfrak{M}^*$. Thus the assertion is also proved in this exceptional case.

It is easy to see that condition A.7 of Section 5.3 is satisfied; the theorem above then follows immediately.

Chapter 7

Branched Coverings

7.1 The Concept of a Branched Covering

In the case of manifolds it is of particular interest to introduce a new type of covering, the *branched covering*, in contrast to which those previously considered may be called *unbranched coverings*. The theory of branched coverings originates from a strictly combinatorial treatment of RIEMANN surfaces and planar discontinuous groups.

If $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{C}^*$ are two surface complexes, we say that $\mathfrak{C}$ is a branched covering of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ when there is a mapping $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$ of the points, line segments, and surface pieces of $\mathfrak{C}$ onto those of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ satisfying the conditions A.1 and A.2 of Section 6.12 and, instead of A.3, satisfying the following.

A.31. *If r is a simple positive boundary path of a surface piece f of $\mathfrak{C}$, let $\boldsymbol{A}(r) = w^*$ be a k-tuply bounding path r^* of the surface piece $\boldsymbol{A}(f) = f^*$, so $w^* = r^{*k}$. If $r = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_k$ and $\boldsymbol{A}(w_i) = r^*$ then $w_i \neq w_l$ for $i \neq l$.*

A.32. *If w' is any path of $\mathfrak{C}$ for which $\boldsymbol{A}(w') = r^*$, where r^* is a boundary path of a surface piece f^* then there is exactly one surface piece f' in $\mathfrak{C}$ in the boundary r' of which w' appears. Let $\boldsymbol{A}(r')$ be a k-tuply bounding path of f^*, so $\boldsymbol{A}(r') = r^{*k}$. Then $k-1$ is called the branching number of f'.*

We are again assuming that in $\mathfrak{C}^*$ each simple positive boundary path of a surface piece f^* bounds this surface piece only positively. If the surface complex $\mathfrak{C}$ covers the surface complex $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$ and $\mathfrak{C}^*$ covers the complex $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}^*) = \mathfrak{C}^{**}$ then the mapping of the elements of $\mathfrak{C}$ onto those of $\mathfrak{C}^{**}$ defined by

$$\boldsymbol{A}''(\mathfrak{C}) = \boldsymbol{A}'(\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C})) = \mathfrak{C}^{**}$$

is also a covering, and it is branched or unbranched according as one of the mappings $\boldsymbol{A}$ or $\boldsymbol{A}'$ is branched or neither are.

If the covering of a surface complex $\mathfrak{M}^*$ by a surface complex $\mathfrak{C}$ is of finite order o, then there is a simple relation between the branching number $k-1$ and the order. *If f^* is a surface piece of $\mathfrak{C}^*$, if*

$$f_1^{\pm 1}, \quad f_2^{\pm 1}, \quad \ldots, \quad f_r^{\pm 1}$$

are the surface pieces over $f^{*\pm 1}$, if $\boldsymbol{A}(f_i) = f^*$, and if $k_i - 1$ is the branching number of f_i, then

$$o = \sum_{i=1}^{r} k_i. \tag{1}$$

For if the boundary path r^* of f^* begins with s^* then by condition A.31 there are exactly k_i subpaths in the boundary path w_i of f_i that lie over r^*, and consequently k_i different segments

$$s_{il} \qquad (l = 1, 2, \ldots, k_i)$$

that lie over s^*. Further, s_{il} and s_{jm} must be different segments over s^* when $i \neq j$. Otherwise the boundary paths of f_i and f_j would be identical, and then by A.32 we should have $f_i = f_j$. Thus there are at least

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} k_i$$

different segments over s^*. On the other hand, since each segment over s^* must be contained in a boundary path of an f_i (again by A.32), (1) is in fact satisfied. As a result, a surface piece f^* is covered by at most o surface pieces f_i.

If $\mathfrak{C}_1, \mathfrak{C}_1^*$ are the line segment complexes of $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{C}^*$ respectively then the branched covering $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$ is already determined by the mapping $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}_1) = \mathfrak{C}_1^*$. For the boundary paths in $\mathfrak{C}$ are characterized as those that, on the one hand, lie over boundary paths of $\mathfrak{C}^*$, and on the other hand are closed.

It follows from this remark that one can define *regular branched coverings* just as for unbranched coverings, as those for which the covering of the associated line segment complex is regular, and one may further define mappings of regular coverings into themselves which exchange elements of $\mathfrak{C}$ lying over the same element of $\mathfrak{C}^*$. On the other hand, the close connection between the fundamental groups of $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{C}^*$ is destroyed by branched coverings.

In the case of regular coverings the branching number of surface pieces that lie over the same f^* are all equal. In this case, if f lies over f^* with branching number $k - 1 \neq 0$ then there is a transformation of $\mathfrak{C}$ into itself which displaces the boundary path of f into itself cyclically and carries f into itself. *Among the regular coverings the branched ones are thus characterized as those that admit transformations with fixed elements (namely, fixed surface pieces).*

Interest in these coverings started because of the theorem that *branched coverings of manifolds are again manifolds.* For when each segment s^* appears in only two boundary paths, $s^* w_1^*$ and $s^* w_2^*$, then the same is true for each segment s lying over s^*.

7.2 Self-transformations and Automorphisms

There are three kinds of group to consider with a regular covering $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$: The fundamental group $\mathfrak{W}$ of the complex $\mathfrak{C}$, the fundamental group $\mathfrak{W}^*$ of the complex

$\mathfrak{C}^*$, and the group $\mathfrak{T}$ of mappings of $\mathfrak{C}$ into itself that corresponds to the regular covering. We have previously investigated the connection between $\mathfrak{W}$ and $\mathfrak{W}^*$ on the one hand, and between $\mathfrak{T}$ and $\mathfrak{W}^*$ on the other, in the case of unbranched coverings, and we will now apply ourselves to the connection between $\mathfrak{T}$ and $\mathfrak{W}$ for arbitrary regular coverings.

Let $p_0, p_1, p_2, \ldots$ be the points of $\mathfrak{C}$ over the same point p^* of $\mathfrak{C}^*$, let $\mathfrak{W}_i$ be the group of closed paths of $\mathfrak{C}$ beginning at p_i, and let T_i be the mapping of $\mathfrak{C}$ onto itself that carries p_0 to p_i. Then the mapping T_i induces an isomorphism $\boldsymbol{I}_i$ between the groups $\mathfrak{W}_0$ and $\mathfrak{W}_i$. But a class of isomorphisms between the groups $\mathfrak{W}_0$ and $\mathfrak{W}_i$ is already known. Namely, if w is a closed path beginning at p_i, and h_i is a path from p_0 to p_i, then $h_i w h_i^{-1}$ is a closed path beginning at p_0 and the mapping

$$[w] \to [h_i w h_i^{-1}] \tag{1}$$

is such an isomorphism $\boldsymbol{I}_i^*$. Thus the transformations $\boldsymbol{I}_i \boldsymbol{I}_i^{*-1}$ are automorphisms of the group $\mathfrak{W}_0 = \mathfrak{W}$, and in fact they form the residue class of automorphisms determined by some representative A_i of the inner automorphisms of $\mathfrak{W}$. The collection of these residue classes of automorphisms constitutes a group $\mathfrak{A}$. When none of the transformations T other than the identity induces an inner automorphism, and if $\mathfrak{I}$ is the group of inner automorphisms of $\mathfrak{W}_0$, which by Section 1.12 is an invariant subgroup of $\mathfrak{A}$, then the factor group $\mathfrak{A}/\mathfrak{I}$ is homomorphic to $\mathfrak{T}$, and indeed isomorphic.

7.3 Principal Group of a Regular Covering

We can throw more light on the connection between $\mathfrak{W}$ and $\mathfrak{T}$ by constructing the universal covering complex $\mathfrak{K}$ of $\mathfrak{C}$. *Let $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{K}) = \mathfrak{C}$ be the mapping of $\mathfrak{K}$ onto $\mathfrak{C}$ and let $\boldsymbol{A}''(\mathfrak{K}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$ be the mapping of $\mathfrak{K}$ onto $\mathfrak{C}^*$ composed from $\boldsymbol{A}'$ and $\boldsymbol{A}$. Then $\boldsymbol{A}''$ is a regular covering of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ by $\mathfrak{K}$.* $\boldsymbol{A}''$ is first of all a covering by transitivity. Regularity means: if w is a closed path of $\mathfrak{K}$ and $\overline{w}$ is a path of $\mathfrak{K}$ for which $\boldsymbol{A}''(w) = \boldsymbol{A}''(\overline{w})$ then $\overline{w}$ is also closed. We now construct $\boldsymbol{A}'(w)$ and $\boldsymbol{A}'(\overline{w})$ and distinguish the two cases

$$\boldsymbol{A}'(w) = \boldsymbol{A}'(\overline{w}) \tag{1}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{A}'(w) \neq \boldsymbol{A}'(\overline{w}). \tag{2}$$

In the first case $\boldsymbol{A}'(w)$ must be a contractible path on $\mathfrak{C}$ by definition of the universal covering complex in Section 6.15, and because w is closed it follows that $\overline{w}$ lies over the same contractible path and hence must also be closed. In the second case we use the fact that $\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{A}'(w)) = \boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{A}'(\overline{w}))$, so that $\boldsymbol{A}'(\overline{w})$ results from $\boldsymbol{A}'(w)$ by a transformation in $\mathfrak{T}$. Thus if $\boldsymbol{A}'(w)$ bounds a surface piece of $\mathfrak{C}$ the same must hold for $\boldsymbol{A}'(\overline{w})$, and consequently $\overline{w}$ is also closed in $\mathfrak{K}$.

If $\mathfrak{C}^*$ is a complex that contains only a single point—and one can convert any connected complex into this form without altering its group, and think of $\mathfrak{C}$ analogously altered—then by Section 4.18 the line segment complex $\mathfrak{K}_1$ contained in

$\mathfrak{K}$ is a group diagram, because the covering $\boldsymbol{A}''(\mathfrak{K}_1) = \mathfrak{C}_1^*$ is regular. The generators and defining relations of the group $\mathfrak{V}$ determined by this group diagram may be read off from those of $\mathfrak{W}^*$. If $s_1^*, s_2^*, \ldots$ are the singular segments of $\mathfrak{C}^*$ and if $r_1^*(s^*), r_2^*(s^*), \ldots, r_n^*(s^*)$ are the simple boundary paths of the surface pieces $f_1^*, f_2^*, \ldots, f_n^*$ of $\mathfrak{C}^*$, and if also the surface piece f_i^* is covered $(k_i - 1)$-tuply by the branched covering, then the generators $S_1, S_2, \ldots$ of $\mathfrak{V}$ correspond uniquely to the $s_1^*, s_2^*, \ldots$ and one obtains the defining relations by replacing the s_i^* by S_i in the power products $r_i^*(s^*)^{k_i}$, because the boundary paths of $\mathfrak{K}$ and $\mathfrak{C}$ lie over the paths $r_i^*(s^*)^{k_i}$. *$\mathfrak{V}$ is called the principal group of the regular covering* $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$.

7.4 Structure of the Principal Group

The structure of the principal group $\mathfrak{V}$ is connected with $\mathfrak{W}_0$ and the automorphisms of $\mathfrak{W}_0$ from $\mathfrak{A}$. The paths w of the group diagram $\mathfrak{K}_1$ that begin and end at points lying over p_0 of $\mathfrak{C}$ determine a *subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ of $\mathfrak{V}$ which is isomorphic to* $\mathfrak{W}_0$. One obtains the power products of $\mathfrak{U}$ by replacing the s_i^* by S_i in $\boldsymbol{A}''(w) = w^*(s^*)$.

If one moves any point p in $\mathfrak{K}_1$ by an element of $\mathfrak{U}$, then the path corresponding to this element ends at a point p' over the same point in $\mathfrak{C}$ as p, $\boldsymbol{A}'(p) = \boldsymbol{A}'(p')$, because the covering $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{C}) = \mathfrak{C}^*$ is regular. Thus the group $\mathfrak{U}$ does not depend on p_0. For this reason, *$\mathfrak{U}$ is an invariant subgroup of $\mathfrak{V}$*. Namely, if U is any word of $\mathfrak{U}$ then, when carried from any point, U determines a path with a closed image in $\mathfrak{C}$, SUS^{-1} determines a path whose image in $\mathfrak{C}$ is a path $sw\overline{s}^{-1}$. Here w is the closed path corresponding to U and hence $s = \overline{s}$, because both segments end at the same point and lie over the same segment s^*. Thus sws^{-1} is again closed, and so SUS^{-1} belongs to $\mathfrak{U}$.

At the same time one sees that *the automorphism of $\mathfrak{U}$ effected by*

$$S\mathfrak{U}S^{-1} = \mathfrak{U}$$

is associated with a definite automorphism of the group given above. For if p is any point of $\mathfrak{C}$ and if w and $w' = sws^{-1}$ are the paths corresponding to the elements U and SUS^{-1}, then the subpath w of w' either begins and ends at a point p' different from p, or else begins and ends at p. In the first case we can use s in place of h in the formula (1) of Section 7.2 and write the automorphism effected by $S\mathfrak{U}S^{-1} = \mathfrak{U}$ as

$$[w] \to [sws^{-1}].$$

In the second case s is a closed path of $\mathfrak{C}$ and thus belongs to the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$, so $S\mathfrak{U}S^{-1} = \mathfrak{U}$ is an inner automorphism of $\mathfrak{U}$.

By Section 4.20 the group diagram $\mathfrak{K}_1$ admits a simply transitive group of transformations $\overline{\mathfrak{V}}$ isomorphic to the group of paths $\mathfrak{V}$. The subgroup $\overline{\mathfrak{U}}$ of $\overline{\mathfrak{V}}$ corresponding to $\mathfrak{U}$ exchanges those points that lie over the same point of $\mathfrak{C}$. These mappings of $\mathfrak{K}_1$ onto itself may be extended to mappings of $\mathfrak{K}$ onto itself.

A mapping T of $\mathfrak{C}$ which carries the point p_0 to the point p_i corresponds to a class of mappings of the covering $\mathfrak{K}$; namely, all those mappings that carry a point over p_0 to a point over p_i. The collection of these transformations forms a residue

class modulo $\overline{\mathfrak{U}}$. *Thus the group* $\mathfrak{T}$ *is isomorphic to the factor group* $\overline{\mathfrak{V}}/\overline{\mathfrak{U}}$ *or* $\mathfrak{V}/\mathfrak{U}$ *respectively.*

Likewise it follows that $\mathfrak{V}$ is homomorphic to the group $\mathfrak{A}$ of automorphisms of $\mathfrak{W}_0$ given above. Namely, if V is any element of $\mathfrak{V}$, then this element is associated with a definite automorphism from $\mathfrak{A}$ by

$$VUV^{-1} = U'. \tag{1}$$

This relation effects a homomorphism of $\mathfrak{V}$ onto $\mathfrak{A}$, which is one-to-one when there are no two elements of $\mathfrak{V}$ that induce the same automorphism in $\mathfrak{U}$; i.e., when

$$V_0 U V_0^{-1} = U \tag{2}$$

being true for all U in $\mathfrak{U}$ implies $V_0 = 1$. In this case the mapping of $\mathfrak{C}$ onto itself corresponding to V_0 is the identity. When none of the transformations T induces an inner automorphism in $\mathfrak{U}$, so that no automorphism (1) is an inner automorphism of $\mathfrak{U}$ unless V belongs to $\mathfrak{U}$, then V_0 in (2) belongs to $\mathfrak{U}$ and indeed, by (2), to the center of $\mathfrak{U}$. In summary we can say:

The group $\mathfrak{A}$ *of automorphisms and the group* $\mathfrak{V}$ *are isomorphic when*

1. each transformation T *in* $\mathfrak{T}$ *different from the identity induces an automorphism which is not an inner automorphism, and*

2. the center of $\mathfrak{U}$ *consists only of the identity element.*

7.5 Group Diagrams and Manifolds

Each group diagram of a finite group can be converted in various ways to a regular covering of an oriented manifold.[1] This is done by cyclically ordering the segments emanating from a point in the group diagram in a certain way. Let s_{ik} be the segments emanating from the point p_k, let $S_i^{\pm 1}$ $(i = 1,2,\ldots,r)$ be the generators corresponding to the segments s_{ik}, and let $\boldsymbol{A}(s_{ik}) = S_i$ $(i = 1,2,\ldots,r)$. Further, let

$$s_{\alpha_1,k}, \quad s_{\alpha_2,k}, \quad \ldots, \quad s_{\alpha_{2r},k}$$

be a star corresponding to one of the points p_k $(k = 1,2,\ldots,o)$ that contains each of the segments emanating from p_k exactly once. *If we now construct the star*

$$\boldsymbol{A}(s_{\alpha_1,k}), \quad \boldsymbol{A}(s_{\alpha_2,k}), \quad \ldots, \quad \boldsymbol{A}(s_{\alpha_{2r},k}) \tag{1}$$

then the same "star" of the S results for all k.

With the help of these stars we define a class of paths that we convert into simple positive boundary paths of our manifold, and which we will already call boundary paths. *The closed path*

$$s_{\beta_1\gamma_1} s_{\beta_2\gamma_2} \cdots s_{\beta_m\gamma_m}$$

is called a positive boundary path $r(s)$ *when*

$$s_{\beta_i,\gamma_i}^{-1}, \quad s_{\beta_{i+1},\gamma_{i+1}} \quad (i = 1,2,\ldots,m-1) \quad \text{and} \quad s_{\beta_m,\gamma_m}^{-1}, \quad s_{\beta_1,\gamma_1}$$

[1] cf. E. STEINITZ: "Polyeder und Raumeinteilungen," Math. Enzykl. III, A, B 12 §48, 49.

appear consecutively in the order given in the star of the point at which they begin. The path $r(s)$ is called a simple boundary path when $r(s)$ contains no subpath which is likewise a boundary path according to the definition.

Each segment may be embedded in at least one simple positive boundary path which runs through it positively, and two different such paths are convertible into each other by cyclic interchange. Likewise, each segment may be embedded in at least one simple positive boundary path which runs through it negatively, and two different such paths are convertible into each other by cyclic interchange. Each boundary path runs through the same segment only once in the same direction, but it can run through a segment in both directions. Thus the boundary paths determined in the above manner have the properties laid down in Section 5.13 for boundary paths of oriented manifolds.

If

$$r_i(s) \qquad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, q)$$

is a system of boundary paths from which all the simple positive boundary paths may be obtained by cyclic interchange of the s, then we introduce q surface pieces $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_q$ with the boundary paths $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_q$. We then have an oriented manifold $\mathfrak{M}$.

The closed paths of the group diagram then fall into two classes: those that are contractible to a point in $\mathfrak{M}$, and those that are not. If w is contractible in $\mathfrak{M}$ and if $\overline{w}$ is another path for which $\boldsymbol{A}(w) = \boldsymbol{A}(\overline{w})$, then $\overline{w}$ is also contractible in $\mathfrak{M}$. For if w is a simple boundary path and $\boldsymbol{A}(w) = \boldsymbol{A}(\overline{w})$ then $\overline{w}$ is also a boundary path because of the condition on the stars of the points p_k.

It follows from this that *mappings of the group diagram may be extended to mappings of the manifold* $\mathfrak{M}$. Of course, such mappings do not in general exchange the surface pieces transitively among themselves.

If one constructs the manifold $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ dual to $\mathfrak{M}$ then $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ likewise admits a group of mappings, under which the surface pieces corresponding to the points of $\mathfrak{M}$, or to those of the group diagram, respectively, are exchanged with each other.

The boundary paths $r_i(s)$ yield a class of relations $R_i(S)$ when one replaces the s in $r_i(s)$ by $\boldsymbol{A}(s)$; at most o of these relations are identical with each other, when o, as above, is the order of the group. If

$$R_i(S) \qquad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, e)$$

are the different relations then, for each R_i, there is a maximal exponent k_i such that

$$R_i = R_i^{*k_i}.$$

Using the R_i^* we can construct a manifold $\mathfrak{M}^*$ which is regularly covered by the manifold $\mathfrak{M}$. Namely, we associate each generator $S_i^{\pm 1}$ with a singular segment $s_i^{*\pm 1}$ beginning and ending at p^*, and as simple positive boundary paths of the surface pieces f_i^* we take the $r_i^*(s^*)$ $(i = 1, 2 \ldots, e)$ which result when one replaces the S_l in $R_i^*(S)$ by s_l^*. The star of segments s^* at p^* then results from the cycle (1) by exchanging the S for the corresponding s^*, and in fact $\mathfrak{M}$ covers $\mathfrak{M}^*$ regularly.

If we construct the universal covering complex $\mathfrak{K}$ of $\mathfrak{M}$ then the line segment complex $\mathfrak{K}_1$ of $\mathfrak{K}$ forms the group diagram of the principal group $\mathfrak{V}$ of this covering with the generators

$$S_l \qquad (l = 1, 2, \ldots, r)$$

and relations

$$R_i = R_i^{*k_i} \qquad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, e).$$

$\mathfrak{K}$ is called a *planar complex* and $\mathfrak{K}_1$, with the cyclic ordering of segments emanating from a point, is called a *planar group diagram of the first kind, and* $\mathfrak{V}$ *is called a planar group of the first kind.*

7.6 Point-type Branching

Under certain conditions one can also define a manifold from the group diagram of an infinite group with finitely many generators, in which one favors a particular cycle of generators; namely, when they give a proper closed boundary path. However, this need not be the case. It can happen, when one wants to embed a segment in a boundary path, that this path does not close. Nevertheless, one obtains a well-defined class of indefinitely extendible paths from the initial segment, or else an infinite open path, which may be called an *infinite boundary path.*

One sees from this that a group diagram with infinite boundary paths can be regarded as the one-dimensional dual complex $\mathfrak{D}_1$ of a manifold $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$, obtained when one allows each point p_i of the group diagram to correspond with a surface piece $\overline{f}_i$ and each class of cyclically related boundary paths, as well as each infinite boundary path, with a point $\overline{p}_k$ of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$. In this way we get a complex that admits a group of transformations under which the surface pieces $\overline{f}_i$ are exchanged simply transitively with each other. Such complexes were originally employed for the representation of arbitrary groups with finitely many generators.[2]

Analogously, one can construct the universal covering complex $\overline{\mathfrak{K}}$ of $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$. $\overline{\mathfrak{K}}$ is called a covering complex of the second kind; the one-dimensional complex $\mathfrak{K}_1$ dual to $\mathfrak{K}$, with the cyclic ordering of segments at a point, is called a *planar group diagram of the second kind*; and the associated group is called a *planar group of the second kind.* If one spans each finite boundary path determined by the cyclic order of the segments at the points by a surface piece, then each simple closed path of $\mathfrak{K}_1$ bounds a surface piece.

We return to the case where the manifold $\mathfrak{M}$ and its dual $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}$ may both be constructed from the group diagram. $\mathfrak{M}$ then covers $\mathfrak{M}^*$ and in fact $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{M}) = \mathfrak{M}^*$. One can then define a manifold $\overline{\mathfrak{M}}^*$ dual to $\mathfrak{M}^*$ and a covering $\boldsymbol{B}(\overline{\mathfrak{M}}) = \overline{\mathfrak{M}}^*$ effected by the dual mapping. If the covering is unbranched then this is also true of $\boldsymbol{B}$, and conversely. If $\boldsymbol{A}$ is branched, however, then $\boldsymbol{B}$ is a new type of covering: *the branching here takes place at points.*

Such a covering cannot be constructed for general surface complexes, because stars do not correspond to points there. On the other hand, for manifolds it is very

[2] W. v. DYCK, Math. Ann. **20** (1882).

easy to give interesting examples of point-type branching, e.g., in the construction of RIEMANN surfaces in function theory and the fundamental domains of discontinuous groups. Moreover, the two types of covering are so closely connected that it does not matter which definition is taken as the starting point.

7.7 Elementarily Related Coverings

Single covering complexes are of less interest than classes of complexes related to each other by elementary transformations. If the manifold $\mathfrak{M}$ covers the manifold $\mathfrak{M}^*$ and if $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{M}) = \mathfrak{M}^*$ is unbranched, and if $\mathfrak{M}^*$ is convertible to $\mathfrak{M}^{*\prime}$ by elementary transformations, then $\mathfrak{M}$ may also be converted to an $\mathfrak{M}'$ by elementary transformations and a covering $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{M}) = \mathfrak{M}^{*\prime}$ defined which agrees with $\boldsymbol{A}$ on those segments that $\mathfrak{M}, \mathfrak{M}'$ as well as $\mathfrak{M}^*, \mathfrak{M}^{*\prime}$ have in common. We have already shown this in Section 6.14. The result is similar for branched coverings. *If $\mathfrak{M}^*$ is altered by an elementary extension then $\mathfrak{M}$ may be analogously altered, and a new branched covering defined for the new manifolds. On the other hand, the reductions possible in $\mathfrak{M}^*$ cannot always be matched by alterations of $\mathfrak{M}$.* Namely, if

$$\boldsymbol{A}(f_i) = f_i^* \qquad (i = 1, 2)$$

and if f_i covers the surface piece f_i^*, branched in both cases, and if f_1^* and f_2^* are both bounded by the segment s^*, then segments lying over s^* cannot be eliminated, because several such appear in the boundaries of f_1 and f_2. On the other hand, if the covering, e.g., of f_2^* by f_2 is unbranched, then one can successively fuse the surface pieces lying over f_2^* with those lying over f_1^* by elementary reductions. Reductions of the first and third kind may always be carried out. An analogue holds for reductions of the first kind in the case of coverings with point-type branching.

If $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{M}) = \mathfrak{M}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{M}') = \mathfrak{M}^{*\prime}$ are two covering complexes related to each other by elementary transformations in the way described, then they may be called *elementarily related* for short.

7.8 Normal Forms of Coverings

After these preliminary remarks we can now bring the branched coverings of the complex $\mathfrak{M}^*$ into normal form and prove the following theorem: *If the covering $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{M}) = \mathfrak{M}^*$ is branched along the surface pieces $f_1^*, f_2^*, \ldots, f_n^*$ with boundary paths $r_1^*, r_2^*, \ldots, r_n^*$ and orders $k_i - 1$ ($k_i \leq k_{i+1}$) then there is an equivalent covering $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{N}) = \mathfrak{N}^*$ in which $\mathfrak{N}^*$ contains one point and n surface pieces f_i^* with the boundary paths*

$$r_i^*(s^*) \quad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1), \qquad r_n^*(s^*) = s_1^* s_2^* \cdots s_{n-1}^* r^*(s^*)$$

where $r^*(s^*)$ is the boundary path of a normal polygon.

First of all, using reductions of the third kind, all points of $\mathfrak{M}^*$ may be coalesced into a single one, and the surface pieces covered without branching may be eliminated by reductions of the second kind. Now if the boundary path of f_1^* in the resulting manifold still runs e.g. through different segments we divide f_1^* into f_{11}^* with the

boundary path $r_{11}^* = t^*$ and f_{12}^* with the boundary path $r_{12}^* = t^{*-1} r_1^*$. If f_1 lies over f_1^* and if the boundary path r_1 of f_1 equals $r_{11} r_{12} \cdots r_{1k}$ with $\boldsymbol{A}(r_{1i}) = r_1^*$, then f_1 is converted into f_{11} with the boundary path $t_1 t_2 \cdots t_k$ and f_{1i} with the boundary path $t_i^{-1} r_{1i}$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, k)$, f_{1i}^* is k-tuply branched and f_{1i}^* is covered without branching. Therefore, f_{1i}^* may be merged with $f_n^{*\prime}$ by elementary reduction. By iteration of these steps we reach a form in which $n-1$ surface pieces f_i^* appear, bounded only by a segment t_i^*. The boundary r_n^* of the last surface piece runs through each of these t_i^* only once, and through the remaining segments twice.

If also $r_n^* = t_\alpha^{*-1} s^* r_{n1}^*$ or $r_n^* = t_\alpha^{*-1} t_\beta^{*-1} r_{n1}^*$ then in four steps we can always reach the boundary path $r_n'^* = s^* t_\alpha'^{*-1} r_{n1}^*$ or $\overline{t}_\beta^{*-1} \overline{t}_\alpha^{*-1} r_{n1}^*$ respectively. In the first case we subdivide f_n^* by a segment u^* into f_{n1}^* with the boundary path $t_\alpha^{*-1} s^* u^*$ and f_{n2}^* with boundary path $u^{*-1} r_{n1}^*$; f_{n1}^* is then covered unbranched and f_{n2}^* is covered branched, and f_{n1}^* may then be merged with f_α^* along t_α^* to form $f_\alpha'^*$ with the boundary path $s^* u^*$. Then we subdivide $f_\alpha'^*$ by $t_\alpha'^*$ into a surface piece $f_\alpha''^*$ with boundary path $t_\alpha'^*$ and $f_{n1}'^*$ with boundary path $s^* u^* t_\alpha'^{*-1}$ and merge $f_{n1}'^*$ and $f_{n2}'^*$ along u^*, since they are covered unbranched. In the second case one proceeds analogously.

By successive applications of these operations one can obtain f_n^* with the boundary path

$$t_1^* t_2^* \cdots t_{n-1}^* r^*(s^*).$$

Here $r^*(s^*)$ is the boundary of a normal polygon, which one can reduce to the canonical normal form by Section 5.11.

In the case of point-type branched coverings one obtains normal forms with a surface piece and n branch points of order $k_i = 1$. The branch points p_i of order $k_i - 1$ $(k_i \leq k_{i+1})$ $(i = 1, 2 \ldots, n-1)$ each bound a regular segment t_i^* which ends at p_n; the boundary path of the surface is then

$$t_1^* t_1^{*-1} t_2^* t_2^{*-1} \cdots t_{n-1}^* {t_{n-1}^*}^{-1} r^*(s^*),$$

where $r^*(s^*)$ is the boundary of a normal polygon of the second kind.

7.9 Principal Groups in Normal Form

The preceding section gives the following result for principal groups:

In normal form, the principal group $\mathfrak{V}$ has the relations

$$\begin{aligned} T_i^{k_i} &= 1 \qquad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1) \\ R_n = R_n^{* k_n} &= (T_1 T_2 \cdots T_{n-1} R(S))^{k_n} = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here $R(S)$ results from $r^*(s^*)$ by replacing the s^* by S. Thus the structure of the group $\mathfrak{V}$ is determined by the branching numbers and the genus of the covering complex $\mathfrak{M}$. In the case of a point-type branched covering, if at least one point has infinite branching order then only relations of the form

$$T_i^{k_i} = 1 \tag{2}$$

remain. Then the group is the free product of cyclic groups.

While it is possible to immediately derive the genus of the covered manifold from the structure of the group in the case of surface-type branched coverings (one constructs the factor group by the commutator group and sets all elements of finite order equal to the identity, obtaining a free ABELIAN group with $2g$ generators, where g is the genus sought), for point-type branching this is in general not the case. For example, the group diagram of a free group with two generators may be realized in the plane in such a way that the manifold covered has genus 0 or 1.

The number of branching surfaces or branch points, respectively, and the branching numbers may be divided into two classes with the help of the following theorem.

Let T_i, S_k be the generators of the group $\mathfrak{V}$ in the normal form, which satisfy the relations (1), (2) respectively. *Then if Q is any element of finite order, so that*

$$Q^q = 1, \qquad (q \neq 0, 1)$$

then

$$Q = LT_i^a L^{-1} \quad \text{or} \quad Q = LR_n^{*\,a} L^{-1}.$$

On the other hand, no T_i is the transform of an element T_l^a with $i \neq l$ or of an element $R_n^{*\,a}$. Assuming this theorem is correct, then the k_i are obviously determined by the group structure. The proof of the theorem follows from the solution of the word problem, which is carried out for planar groups of the first kind with the restriction $k_i \geq 5$ in Sections 7.15 to 7.17, and for planar groups of the second kind in Section 2.6.

Using the relation to the covered complex, one can very easily elucidate the structure of the diagrams of planar groups in normal form. In the case of groups of the first kind, each segment bounds exactly two surface pieces. Surrounding each point, in the normal form there are $n-1$ surface pieces which correspond to the $n-1$ relations $T_i^{k_i}$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1)$, the latter being connected by a surface piece corresponding to the relation R_n. Between $T_1^{k_1}$ and $T_n^{k_n}$ there are $2g$ surface pieces corresponding to the relation R_n. The $n+2g-1$ surface pieces around each point corresponding to the relation R_n correspond to the $n+2g-1$ different relations resulting from R_n by cyclic permutation. Thus one can construct the group diagrams of our groups by geometric rules.

7.10 Properties of Elementarily Related Coverings

If the coverings $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{M}) = \mathfrak{M}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{M}') = \mathfrak{M}^{*\prime}$ are equivalent, then the associated groups $\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{V}, \mathfrak{U}$ and $\mathfrak{T}', \mathfrak{A}', \mathfrak{V}', \mathfrak{U}'$ are isomorphic. More precisely, there is an isomorphism between $\mathfrak{V}$ and $\mathfrak{V}'$ which maps the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ of $\mathfrak{V}$ onto the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}'$ of $\mathfrak{V}'$. This isomorphism alone suffices to guarantee the equivalence. However, the equivalence of arbitrary coverings may be reduced to the equivalence of planar coverings.

If $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{K}) = \mathfrak{N}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{K}') = \mathfrak{N}^{*\prime}$ are two planar coverings connected by a chain of elementary transformations, then this determines an isomorphism between their

groups $\mathfrak{V}$ and $\mathfrak{V}'$. If T_i, S_i and T_i', S_i' are the generators of $\mathfrak{V}$ and $\mathfrak{V}'$ respectively, and if $\boldsymbol{I}(\mathfrak{V}') = \mathfrak{V}$ is the given isomorphism then

$$\boldsymbol{I}(T_i') \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{I}(S_i')$$

are certain power products in the T_i, S_i. If the two complexes $\mathfrak{K}$ and $\mathfrak{K}'$ are isomorphic as well, then the relations between the T_i, S_i are exactly the same as those between T_i', S_i' and the transformation $\overline{T}_i = \boldsymbol{I}(T_i), \overline{S}_i = \boldsymbol{I}(S_i)$ is consequently an automorphism of the group $\mathfrak{V}$. The collection of automorphisms effected by elementary transformations in this way constitutes a group $\mathfrak{G}$.

Now if $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{M}) = \mathfrak{M}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{M}') = \mathfrak{M}^{*\prime}$ are two coverings in normal form, and $\mathfrak{V}, \mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{V}', \mathfrak{U}'$ are the associated groups, then for the two coverings to be elementarily related it is necessary and sufficient that under the mapping

$$S_i \to S_i', \quad T_i \to T_i'$$

of $\mathfrak{V}$ onto $\mathfrak{V}'$, $\mathfrak{U}$ is also mapped onto $\mathfrak{U}'$, or else that there is an automorphism in $\mathfrak{G}$ that maps $\mathfrak{V}'$ onto itself and carries $\mathfrak{U}'$ to $\mathfrak{U}''$, where $\mathfrak{U}$ goes to $\mathfrak{U}''$ under the mapping $S_i \to S_i'$, $T_i \to T_i'$.

Given two coverings for which the group $\mathfrak{V}$ is isomorphically related to $\mathfrak{V}'$ by means of $\boldsymbol{I}_1(\mathfrak{V}) = \mathfrak{V}'$, $\mathfrak{U}$ goes to $\mathfrak{U}'$, and if also an isomorphism $\boldsymbol{I}_2(\mathfrak{V}) = \mathfrak{V}'$ is effected between $\mathfrak{V}$ and $\mathfrak{V}'$ by elementary transformations, under which the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ goes to the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}''$, then $\mathfrak{U}''$ results naturally from $\mathfrak{U}'$ by an automorphism of $\mathfrak{V}'$, $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{V}') = \mathfrak{V}'$. However, this is not to say that $\boldsymbol{A}$ belongs to $\mathfrak{G}$. The question whether any isomorphism $\boldsymbol{I}_1$ of $\mathfrak{V}$ onto $\mathfrak{V}'$ guarantees the elementary relatedness of the associated coverings comes down to the question of whether the automorphisms of $\mathfrak{V}$ effected by elementary transformations are all the automorphisms of $\mathfrak{V}$ or not. For unbranched coverings $\mathfrak{G}$ is the full automorphism group (cf. Section 6.1), otherwise this is only a tentative conjecture.

7.11 Subgroups of Planar Groups

Let $\mathfrak{K}$ be a planar covering complex with $\boldsymbol{A}(\mathfrak{K}) = \mathfrak{M}^*$, *let $\mathfrak{V}$ be the group of transformations of the complex $\mathfrak{K}$ onto itself and let $\mathfrak{U}$ be any subgroup of $\mathfrak{V}$. Then there is a complex $\mathfrak{M}$ and a regular covering $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{K}) = \mathfrak{M}$ such that two elements of $\mathfrak{K}$ lie over the same element of $\mathfrak{M}$ if and only if they can be carried into each other by a transformation from $\mathfrak{U}$.*

We can first construct the one-dimensional complex $\mathfrak{M}_1$ of $\mathfrak{K}$ and a covering $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{K}_1) = \mathfrak{M}_1$ by Section 4.20, and then carry over the cyclic ordering of segments through a point from $\mathfrak{K}_1$ to $\mathfrak{M}_1$, and hence construct $\mathfrak{M}$ with the help of the boundary paths now determined in $\mathfrak{M}_1$. Then there is also a covering $\boldsymbol{A}''(\mathfrak{M}) = \mathfrak{M}^*$. This likewise follows as in Section 4.20. $\boldsymbol{A}''$ is a regular covering or not according as $\mathfrak{U}$ is an invariant subgroup of $\mathfrak{V}$ or not. If $\boldsymbol{A}''$ is an unbranched covering, then so is $\boldsymbol{A}'$; if $\boldsymbol{A}''$ is a branched covering then $\boldsymbol{A}'$ can be branched or unbranched. Only in the latter case is $\mathfrak{U}$ isomorphic to the fundamental group of $\mathfrak{M}$.

However, $\mathfrak{U}$ always possesses a planar group diagram. In order to construct such a group diagram we construct a complete system of fundamental domains of the

complex $\mathfrak{K}_1$ modulo the group $\mathfrak{U}$, as in Section 4.17. Let $\mathfrak{B}_1$ be a tree, the points of which cannot be carried to each other by transformations in $\mathfrak{U}$, but such that each point of $\mathfrak{K}$ may be carried to a point of $\mathfrak{B}_1$ by such a transformation. Let $\mathfrak{B}_2, \mathfrak{B}_3, \ldots$ be the trees that result from $\mathfrak{B}_1$ by transformations in $\mathfrak{U}$. Further, let $\mathfrak{B}$ be the tree of $\mathfrak{M}$ for which $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{B}_1) = \mathfrak{B}$. If we now contract the trees $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{B}_i$ to single points p, p_i we get two new complexes $\mathfrak{M}', \mathfrak{K}'$ and a covering $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{K}') = \mathfrak{M}'$, and $\mathfrak{K}'_1$ yields a group diagram of $\mathfrak{U}$; for the regularly covered manifold $\mathfrak{M}'$ now contains only one point. $\mathfrak{U}$ is obviously the principal group of the covering $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{K}) = \mathfrak{M}'$. It follows further that subgroups of planar groups of the first (second) kind are themselves planar groups of the first (second) kind.

7.12 Branching Numbers of Subgroups

One can obtain a simple criterion for deciding whether the paths in $\mathfrak{K}'$ corresponding to the relations $R_i^{*k_i}(S)$ in $\mathfrak{V}$ are branched or unbranched in the covering $\boldsymbol{A}'(\mathfrak{K}') = \mathfrak{M}'$ from the behavior of the residue classes of the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ of $\mathfrak{V}$. Let

$$L_1, \quad L_2, \quad \ldots, \quad L_n$$

be a complete system of representatives of the residue classes $\mathfrak{U}L$ in $\mathfrak{V}$. The tree $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{M}$ and the L_i can be chosen in such a way that the simple paths in the tree emanating from a point p correspond uniquely to the power products $L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_n$ in the generators of $\mathfrak{V}$. The same holds for the simple paths in the trees $\mathfrak{B}_i$ emanating from the points p_i. If V is any element of $\mathfrak{V}$, then by $\overline{V}$ we understand the representative of the residue class $\mathfrak{U}V$, as in Section 3.1.

Now let R^{*k} be one of the relations $R_i^{*k_i}$. Obviously

$$\overline{VR^k} = \overline{V}$$

because $R^k \equiv 1$. If $\overline{VR^l} = \overline{V}$ for a particular V, then also

$$\overline{VR^{2l}} = \overline{\overline{VR^l}R^l} = \overline{\overline{V}R^l} = \overline{VR^l} = \overline{V},$$

and hence in general $\overline{VR^{ml}} = \overline{V}$. It follows that for each V there is a smallest l that divides k and for which $\overline{VR^l} = \overline{V}$. *If $k = l\,m$ then we may put*

$$\overline{V}R^k\overline{V}^{-1} = (\overline{V}R^l\overline{VR^l}^{-1}\overline{VR^l}R^l\overline{VR^{2l}}^{-1}\cdots\overline{VR^{(k-1)l}}^{-1}R^l\overline{V}^{-1}) = (\overline{V}R^l\overline{V}^{-1})^m.$$

Then the path corresponding to this power product in $\mathfrak{K}$ or $\mathfrak{K}'$ covers a path in $\mathfrak{M}'$ with branching order $m-1$. it is clear that the order of branching is at least $m-1$. To see that it is not greater we must establish that the power product that results from

$$\overline{V}R^l\overline{V}^{-1},$$

when we express it in terms of of the generators of $\mathfrak{U}$, cannot be written as a formal power of $(R'')^a$. But now, in the case where $\mathfrak{V}$ has at least two defining relations in

the normal form (1) of Section 7.9, we can set $R = SR'$, where the generator S no longer appears in R'. Then

$$\overline{V}R^l\overline{V}^{-1} = \prod_{i=0}^{l-1} \overline{VR^i}S\overline{VR^iS}^{-1}\overline{VR^i}SR'\overline{VR^{i+1}}^{-1}$$

and the

$$\overline{VR^i}S\overline{VR^iS}^{-1} \qquad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, l-1)$$

are formally different generators of $\mathfrak{U}$ by the definition of l. One argues quite similarly when $\mathfrak{V}$ has only one defining relation in normal form.

One sees at the same time that the branching numbers belonging to a subgroup are divisors of the branching numbers of the group itself. If

$$\overline{VR_i^{*l}} \neq \overline{V} \qquad (l = 1, 2, \ldots, k_i - 1)$$

for all elements V and all R_i^*, then the covering associated with the subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ is unbranched and so $\mathfrak{U}$ is isomorphic to the fundamental group of the manifold $\mathfrak{M}'$.

The paths $\overline{V}_1R^k\overline{V}_1^{-1}$ and $\overline{V}_2R^k\overline{V}_2^{-1}$ can be covered with branching of different orders. However, if $\mathfrak{U}$ is an invariant subgroup then the order is the same for all V. Namely, if $\overline{V_1R^l} = \overline{V}$ then $\overline{R^l} \equiv 1$ and hence in general $\overline{VR^l} = \overline{V}$.

Analogous theorems hold for coverings of group diagrams of the second kind, including one for subgroups of planar groups of the second kind. Thus subgroups of a free product of cyclic groups are again free products of cyclic groups, as was proved purely group theoretically in Section 3.9. The subgroups for which all closed boundary paths are covered without branching are free groups. The criteria for unbranched covering of a path are the same.

7.13 Automorphisms of Groups of Manifolds

In Section 7.2 we referred to the close connection between the automorphisms induced by mappings T of a regular covering complex onto itself and the structure of the group $\mathfrak{V}$ belonging to the covering. One can use this connection to investigate the properties of an individual automorphism. We will give a simple example, confining ourselves to investigating automorphisms in the case of a cyclic mapping group $\mathfrak{T}$, since each automorphism realized by transformation of a regular covering complex onto itself will be among those induced in cyclic mapping groups.

Accordingly, let $\mathfrak{V}$ be a group in the normal form

$$T_i^{k_i} \equiv 1, \quad (T_1T_2\cdots T_{n-1}R(S))^{k_n} = R_n \equiv 1,$$

let $\mathfrak{U}$ be an invariant subgroup of $\mathfrak{V}$ of index q, isomorphic to the fundamental group of a manifold, and let

$$V^i \qquad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, q-1)$$

be a complete set of representatives of $\mathfrak{U}$. Then if

$$\overline{T_i} = V^{\alpha_i} \qquad 0 \leq \alpha_i < q$$

in the notation of Section 3.1 we must have $\alpha_i \neq 0$, otherwise the path corresponding to $T_i^{k_i}$ would be covered branched. If the greatest common divisor of α_i and q is

$$(\alpha_i, q) = \delta_i \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_i = \beta_i \delta_i, \quad q = \gamma_i \delta_i,$$

then $\overline{T^l} = \overline{T^{l'}}$ if and only if

$$l \equiv l' \pmod{\gamma_i}.$$

Since $\overline{T_i^{k_i}} = 1$, $k_i \equiv 0 \pmod{\gamma_i}$, otherwise we would have $k_i \neq \gamma_i$ and the path corresponding to $T_i^{k_i}$ would again be covered branched. The analogous result holds for R_n. Thus all k_i are divisors of q.

We now focus on the case where q is a prime number and so all $k_i = q$. We can then choose T_1^i $(i = 0, 1, \ldots, q-1)$ as representatives of the residue classes. If we denote the generators T_i, S_i of the subgroup in the process by

$$T_{ik} \qquad (i = 1, 2 \ldots, n-1; k = 0, 1, \ldots, q-1)$$

and S_{ik}, then the relations of the second kind say that

$$T_{1k} \equiv 1 \qquad (k = 0, 1, \ldots, q-2)$$

and it follows from $T_1^q \equiv 1$ that $T_{1,q-1} \equiv 1$. Any of the q relations that follow from $T_1^q \equiv 1$ and $R_n \equiv 1$ are cyclic interchanges of each other. The former reads

$$T_{il_1} T_{il_i} \cdots T_{il_q} \equiv 1 \tag{1}$$

where

$$l_1, \quad l_2, \quad \ldots, \quad l_q$$

is a permutation of the numbers $0, 1, \ldots, q-1$. The latter relation contains each T_{ik} exactly once and each S_{ik} once with exponent $+1$ and once with exponent -1. Under the automorphism in $\mathfrak{U}$ effected by T_1

$$T_{ik}, S_{ik} \text{ with } k < q-1 \text{ go to } T'_{ik} = T_{i,k+1}, S'_{ik} = S_{i,k+1}$$

and

$$S_{i,q-1}, T_{i,q-1} \text{ go to } S'_{i,q-1} = S_{i0}, T'_{i,q-1} = T_{i0}.$$

We now ask about the form of the automorphism induced in the factor group $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathfrak{U}$ by the commutator group by the automorphism effected by transformation T_1. $\mathfrak{F}$ is a free commutative group. The relations can now in fact be solved, since (1) makes it possible to express $T_{i,q-1}$ in terms of the remaining T_{ik}:

$$T_{i,q-1} = T_{i0}^{-1} T_{i1}^{-1} \cdots T_{i,q-2}^{-1}.$$

On the other hand the last relation, resulting from R_n, becomes a consequence relation since the S_{ik} cancel out. Accordingly, we take T_{ik}, S_{ik} with $k < q-1$ as generators of $\mathfrak{F}$ and construct the matrix that expresses the passage from T_{ik}, S_{ik} to T'_{ik}, S'_{ik}. The latter has, on its main diagonal, -1 in the rows corresponding to the $T'_{i,q-2}$ and

0 elsewhere. *The trace of the matrix is therefore equal to* $-n+1$. This is a special case of a general theorem proved by other methods by NIELSEN.[3]

One sees that *the automorphisms in* $\mathfrak{F}$ *induced by transformation with* T *are uniquely determined by the numbers* q, n, *and* g. One can ask for a complete characterization of the automorphisms induced in $\mathfrak{U}$ itself. For this purpose one has to consider on the one hand the different automorphisms of finite order q which the elements of $\mathfrak{V}$ induce in $\mathfrak{U}$ by transformation. For in general V^q brings about an inner automorphism of $\mathfrak{U}$ which is not the identity. It is not hard to see that those elements V for which $V\mathfrak{U}V^{-1} = \mathfrak{U}'$ is of finite order are exactly the elements of $\mathfrak{V}$ of finite order, and that the finite order elements of $\mathfrak{V}$ are exactly the elements

$$LT_i^l L^{-1}, \quad LR_n^l L^{-1}.$$

On the other hand, one has to investigate the totality of invariant subgroups $\mathfrak{U}$ of index q in $\mathfrak{V}$, and their equivalence under the automorphism group $\mathfrak{G}$ of $\mathfrak{V}$ determined by elementary transformations.

7.14 The Word Problem for Planar Groups

In conclusion we will consider the word problem for planar group diagrams.[4] To the extent that one can search for each word as a path in the group diagram, and construct the group diagram in the plane by laying down successive polygons, one can regard the word problem as already solved. However, this remark alone gives no insight into how one can decide the word problem, since one does not yet know which words are equal to the identity. However, the word problem can also be solved in this strict sense for many of these groups.

The fundamental group of the sphere is the identity, that of the projective plane is the cyclic group of order 2, that of the torus is the free ABELIAN group with two generators. Since the groups corresponding to planar group diagrams of the second kind are free products of cyclic groups there are no difficulties in all these cases.

We now take the fundamental group $\mathfrak{W}$ of an orientable manifold of genus $g > 1$ and a system of $2g$ generators S_i and the relations $R(S)$ that correspond to boundary paths of a normal form. In R there are two generators S_1, S_2 that mutually separate each other. If we also set

$$S_i \equiv 1 \qquad (i \neq 1)$$

then a cyclic factor group results. Thus there is an invariant subgroup $\mathfrak{I}$ of $\mathfrak{W}$, the residue classes of which are represented by

$$S_1^k \qquad (k = 0, \pm 1, \ldots).$$

We claim that $\mathfrak{I}$ *is a free group with infinitely many generators.* By applying the process we obtain generators

$$S_{ik} = S^k S_i S^{-k}$$

[3] J. NIELSEN, Acta Math. **50** (1927) 189.
[4] Cf. M. DEHN, Math. Ann. **72** (1912) 413.

and $S_{1k} = 1$ as relations of the second kind. If we express $S^l R S^{-l}$ in terms of the S_{ik} as prescribed then an $S_{2,a+l}$ and an $S_{2,a+l+1}$ always appear in the latter only once, with exponents ± 1. Thus one can solve all relations by again retaining S_{20} as generator and eliminating all the remaining S_{2k}. The result is a free group, with generators

$$S_{20}, S_{ik} \qquad (i = 3, 4, \ldots, 2g; k = 0, \pm 1, \ldots).$$

Since each element of $\mathfrak{W}$ may be brought into the form $S_1^l S$, where S belongs to $\mathfrak{I}$, and since the word problem for $\mathfrak{I}$ may be solved as in Section 2.3, the word problem for $\mathfrak{W}$ is also solved.

One can solve the word problem for planar groups of the first kind by similar considerations, whereby one seeks an invariant subgroup isomorphic to the fundamental group of an orientable manifold.

The same ideas can be applied to handle the groups $\mathfrak{W}'$ of non-orientable manifolds. Here it is useful to begin with a normal form with boundary path $r(s) = s_1^2 s_2^2 \cdots s_g^2$. One constructs the invariant subgroup $\mathfrak{U}$ corresponding to the factor group $S_1 = S_i$ $(i = 2, 3, \ldots, g)$, $S_1^2 = 1$. If one takes the identity element and S_1 as representatives of the residue classes modulo $\mathfrak{U}$ and

$$S_{ik} \qquad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, g; k = 0, 1)$$

as generators of $\mathfrak{U}$, then $S_{10} = 1$ on the basis of the relations of the second kind. $R(S)$ implies two relations which both contain all S_{ik} $(i \geq 2)$ and S_{11} exactly once with exponent $+1$. By elimination of S_{11} one obtains a relation between the S_{ik} which contains each S_{ik} once with exponent $+1$ and once with exponent -1. As a subgroup of a manifold group, $\mathfrak{U}$ is also the group of a manifold $\mathfrak{M}$, and $\mathfrak{M}$ is orientable, as one sees from the form of the relations for $\mathfrak{U}$. Consequently, the word problem is solved in $\mathfrak{U}$ and hence also in $\mathfrak{W}'$.

7.15 Word Problems in Planar Group Diagrams

A sharper theorem is the following one on planar group diagrams of the first kind, the relations of which have length at least 4, and for which there is consequently a normal form with $k_i \geq 4$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1)$, or which possess only the one relation R^{*k}. Thus these groups include the groups of orientable manifolds. Under the hypotheses just given we have:

If W is a word that represents the identity element then W contains a subword W^* which can be made into a defining relation or its inverse by inserting suitable factors $S_\alpha^{\pm 1}$, $S_\beta^{\pm 1}$. If the length of all defining relations is greater than 4 then it is clear that the word problem can be solved on the basis of this theorem.[5]

If w is a path corresponding to a word W in the group diagram, then w contains a subpath $\overline{w}$ which is a simple closed path and hence bounds a regular surface piece. If the theorem is proved for the words W that correspond to simpler closed paths w,

[5]Because extending W^* to a defining relation, then canceling this defining relation, causes a net decrease in the length of the word. This is essentially *Dehn's algorithm*, found in the paper of M. DEHN, Math. Ann. **72**, (1912). (Translator's note.)

then it holds in general. We prove the claim for these words by induction, with the help of the following theorems.

Theorem 1. *If w is a simple closed path of the group diagram which is not a simple boundary path, then two other simple closed paths w_1 and w_2 may always be given which run through at most two common segments and, when w_1, w_2 are combined and reduced, they yield a path which results from w by cyclic interchange.*

Theorem 2. *If w is a simple closed path, then there are at least four subpaths r (called critical subpaths) of w which may be converted to simple boundary paths of surface pieces in the interior of w by the insertion of two segments. If w has exactly k subpaths S_1S_2 which appear in the boundary paths of surface pieces not in the interior of w—"re-entrant vertices" as we will say—then w has at least $4+k$ critical subpaths.*

7.16 Re-entrant Vertices and Critical Subpaths

Assuming Theorem 1, we prove Theorem 2 by complete induction. It is convenient in the following proof to imagine a Euclidean net of squares. Theorem 2 holds for simple boundary paths and for simple paths that contain exactly two surface pieces in their interior. This is because boundary paths of two surface pieces which meet along a segment have only this one segment in common. If one takes two segments out of a path w satisfying Theorem 2 then at most two critical subpaths are destroyed, so we will suppose that w is a simple boundary path. Because when two critical subpaths have segments in common they bound the same surface piece f; w is then either identical with the boundary of f or else w runs through all boundary segments of f except one. If two critical subpaths are destroyed by taking segments out, then s is an inner segment of a critical subpath.

It follows that: *if w_1 and w_2 are two paths satisfying the statement of Theorem 2 and if $w = w_1'w_2'$ is a simple path resulting from w_1w_2 by omission of a segment, then w also satisfies our theorem.* This is clear if w contains no new re-entrant vertices. For if k_i is the number of re-entrant vertices of w_i, then the number of critical subpaths in w_i' is at least $2+k_i$. Suppose now that, say, the endpoint of w_1' is a re-entrant vertex of w. Then the segment eliminated by reduction is certainly not at the same time an inner segment of a critical subpath of w_1 and w_2, so w_1' or w_2' still contains at least $3+k_1$ or $3+k_2$ critical subpaths. If the final point of w_2' is also a re-entrant vertex then the segment removed by reduction again appears in no critical subpath of w_1 and w_2, or in only one from w_1 or w_2. Thus the number of critical subpaths contained in the w_i' is either $4+k_i$ or $3+k_i$.

We now assume that two segments are eliminated from each of w_1, w_2 in the reduction of $w = w_1'w_2'$.

1. Either w_1 loses a re-entrant vertex in the process, in which case at most two critical subpaths are destroyed by omission of the two end segments of w_1 and w_1' has at least $2+k_1$ critical subpaths.

1a. Either w_2 is now a simple boundary path, so that $w = w_1'w_2'$ has at least $2+k_1+1$ critical subpaths and k_1-1 re-entrant vertices when new re-entrant vertices do not result from from the join. But if this is the case, fewer critical subpaths of w_1 can be destroyed by leaving out the reduced segments.

1b. Otherwise w_2 is not a simple boundary path, so w_2' contains at least $2+k_2$ critical subpaths and the theorem remains correct in case at most one re-entrant vertex results, because w contains $4+k_1+k_2$ critical subpaths. If, on the other hand, two re-entrant vertices result, then either there are $3+k_1$ critical subpaths still in w_1' or, if that is not the case, the two segments in w_2 removed by reduction either constitute a critical subpath or else they belong to no such path at all. Thus the theorem also holds in this case.

2. Finally we suppose that w_1 and w_2 lose no re-entrant vertex. If no re-entrant vertex results, then the theorem is correct. However, one re-entrant vertex may result and w_1' may really have two critical subpaths fewer than w_1. Then at most one critical subpath is destroyed in w_2. If two re-entrant vertices result and w_1' contains two critical subpaths fewer than w_1 then no critical subpaths at all are destroyed in w_2; and if w_1' contains one critical subpath fewer than w_1 then in w_2 at most one is destroyed.

Thus the proof of Theorem 2 has been completed, assuming Theorem 1.

7.17 Simple Paths in Planar Complexes

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 1. *If w is a simple closed path* and w contains no point in its interior, then the assertion is correct. *If w contains points then we have to show that there is at least one point among these from which two segments lead to points of w*. Suppose this is not the case. We construct the complex $\mathfrak{C}$ consisting of the points in the interior of w and all the segments connecting these points with each other. The points of $\mathfrak{C}$ then have order $2m$ or $2m-1$.

Now we construct the "boundary" of the complex $\mathfrak{C}$ in the following way. If p is a point of order $2m-1$ and s is the segment from p to a point of w, then two surface pieces meet along s, with positive simple boundary paths $r_1 s$ and $s^{-1}r_2$. The r_i each run through a second point of order $2m-1$ and we can therefore set

$$r_i = r_{i1} r_{i2}$$

and conclude that r_{12} and r_{21} only run through segments of $\mathfrak{C}$ that begin and end at points of order $2m-1$, and no other such points. These paths r_{12} and r_{21} may be called the "auxiliary paths" bounded by p. Different auxiliary paths, being subpaths of simple boundary paths, cannot intersect. By linking up the auxiliary paths we put together reduced closed paths w_i that may be called "boundary paths of $\mathfrak{C}$." All segments of $\mathfrak{C}$ branching off a boundary path lie on the same side of it, say the negative side. Each path w_i contains a simple closed subpath w_{i0} which begins and ends at p_0 say. All points lying in the interior of w_{i0} belong to $\mathfrak{C}$ and are of order $2m$. Consequently, the complex $\mathfrak{C}_{i0}$ consisting of the points and line segments of w_{i0} and the points, line segments, and surface pieces in its interior has the following properties.

1. All points in the interior are of order $2m$ with $m > 1$.

2. All points on the boundary different from p_0 are of order $2m$ or $2m-1$.

3. The simple boundary paths of the surface pieces in $\mathfrak{C}_{i0}$ run through at least four line segments.

4. The complex $\mathfrak{C}_{i0}$ is topologically equivalent to a surface piece.

One easily verifies that such a complex cannot exist.

Let a_{01} be the number of boundary points distinct from p_0, let a_{02} be the number of interior points, and let $2a_1$ and $2a_2$ respectively be the numbers of line segments and surface pieces of $\mathfrak{C}_{i0}$. Then on the one hand

$$2a_1 \geq (2m-1)a_{01} + 2m a_{02} + 2, \tag{1}$$

and on the other hand

$$2a_1 \geq 4a_2 + a_{01} + 1. \tag{2}$$

Also, by Section 5.3,

$$a_1 = a_{01} + a_{02} + a_2. \tag{3}$$

Hence, by addition of (1) and (2) and subtraction of 4 times (3) we obtain

$$0 \geq (2m-4)(a_{01} + a_{02}) + 3,$$

which is a contradiction.

7.18 Planar Group Diagrams and Non-Euclidean Geometry

The fact that the solution of the word problem in the preceding section depends on certain restrictions has its origin in various properties of the groups themselves. The groups with the relations

$$S^n = 1, \tag{1}$$

$$S^2 = T^2 = (ST)^n = 1, \tag{2}$$

$$S^2 = T^3 = (ST)^k = 1 \quad (k = 3,4,5) \tag{3}$$

are finite groups, otherwise [for $k > 5$] infinite; (2) is called the dihedral group, (3) are called the tetrahedral, octahedral, and icosahedral groups for $k = 3,4,5$ respectively. These groups may be represented by rotations of the sphere or motions of spherical geometry, as is well known. The groups

$$STS^{-1}T^{-1} = 1, \tag{4}$$

$$S^2 = T^3 = (ST)^6 = 1, \tag{5}$$

$$S^2 = T^4 = (ST)^4 = 1, \tag{6}$$

$$S^2 = T^2 = U^2 = (STU)^2 = 1 \tag{7}$$

may be represented by motions of Euclidean geometry, and the remaining plane groups by motions of non-Euclidean geometry.

The proof of this is best obtained in connection with point-type branched covering complexes. The surface pieces of the complex, which are transitively exchanged with each other by the group of the complex, may be realized as polygons bounded by straight lines, and hence the whole complex may be realized by a rectilinear polygonal net. The angles of these polygons may be derived from the branching numbers of the group; e.g., the fundamental domain for (4) is the parallelogram, that for (5) an isosceles triangle with top angle 120°, that for (6) an isosceles right-angled triangle, and for (7) an equilateral triangle. The corresponding groups of Euclidean motions are in the case of (4) just translations; the others contain rotations that leave a vertex of the fundamental domain fixed and rotate through the angle of the fundamental domain or a multiple of it, and in the case of (5) and (6) also rotations through 180° about the midpoint of the base of the fundamental domain and, in case of (7), 180° rotations about the midpoints of the three sides of the triangle.

The elements of finite order o in the group also correspond to rotations through an angle $2\pi/o$ in the case of representation by motions of non-Euclidean geometry. One can use this connection to prove that all elements of finite order in a planar group are transforms of T_i or R_n^* in the notation of Section 7.9 (1).

The connection with non-Euclidean geometry, discovered by POINCARÉ, has been used in many investigations, e.g., in the important work of NIELSEN[6] on the mappings of surfaces and the fixed point problem. Conversely, the theory of planar groups has also been of help in the investigation of these groups of motions,[7] which are of great importance because of their connection with automorphic functions and uniformization.

Finally in this connection we refer to the interesting questions raised and answered by STEINITZ,[8] on the topological chacterization of complexes equivalent to the sphere that may be realized as convex polyhedra in Euclidean space.

[6] J. NIELSEN, Acta Math. **50** (1927) 189 and **53** (1929) 1; H. GIESEKING Analytische Untersuchungen über topologische Gruppen (Dissertation) Münster 1912.

[7] E. HECKE, Hamb. Abhdl. **8** (1930) 271 and H. RADEMACHER Ibid. **7** (1929) 134.

[8] E. STEINITZ "Polyeder und Raumeinteilung," Math. Enzykl. III, AD 12.